3/

TURNING POINTS

OF

ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

TURNING POINTS
OF
ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

BY
EDWARD L. CUTTS, D.D.

THIRTIETH THOUSAND

LONDON
SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING
CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE
NEW YORK AND TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN CO.
1924

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN.

PREFACE

THE plan of this little book is, not to give a connected history of the Church of England, but to put before the reader some of its principal points, especially those which will help him to understand the Church questions of the present day.

It has not been thought necessary in such a sketch as this to quote authorities; but it may be desirable to state that pains have been taken to make the work accurate and impartial. To secure this the more effectually, the writer is permitted to say, that the proof sheets have been carefully revised by the Rev. W. Stubbs, Regius Professor of Modern History at Oxford, one of our greatest authorities on ecclesiastical history. He is not to be held answerable for any opinions the work may contain, but his corrections and suggestions have added to its value, and his supervision will give the reader confidence in its general correctness.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE. 1924

OWING to the continued demand this book has been reprinted. With the consent of the author's representatives a very few alterations have been made (chiefly on pages 222, 303, 310, 311) of statements which the lapse of time had rendered misleading.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

BRITANNIA

PAGE

Situated outside the ancient world; Cæsar's first invasion; description of the country and people; the Druids; Cæsar's second invasion; the conquest under Claudius; the Roman province 1

CHAPTER II

THE BRITISH CHURCH

The legends of the introduction of Christianity: St. Paul; Bran, the father of Caractacus; the Glastonbury legend; the legend of King Lucius; the Christian Church introduced into Britain from Gaul about 250 A.D.; the martyrdom of St. Alban; British bishops at the Council of Arles—of Sardica; the Pelagian heresy; prevalence of Christianity in Roman Britain; peculiarities of the British Church . . 10

CHAPTER III

THE SAXON CONQUEST

The Romans withdraw from Britain; the Saxon conquest; the British Church destroyed or driven away; the religion of the Anglo-Saxons 22

CHAPTER IV

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

PAGE

Episcopal constitution of the primitive Church; Bishops of equal power and authority; gradual grouping of sees into provinces—into patriarchates; attempt of the Bishop of Constantinople to make himself head of the Church—resisted by the Bishop of Rome 28

CHAPTER V

THE SAXON CONVERSION: THE ITALIAN MISSION

The Saxon slaves in the Roman forum; Augustine's mission; Kent converted; Italian mission in East Anglia—in Essex—in Northumbria; discussion of Christianity before the Northumbrian Witan; apostasy of the East Anglians, East Saxons, and Northumbrians; conversion of Wessex . . . 36

CHAPTER VI

THE FOUNDING OF IONA

St. Patrick born near Glasgow—educated and ordained in Gaul—becomes the Apostle of Ireland; St. Columba born—educated and ordained in Ireland—founds Iona, which becomes a great centre of missionary work 45

CHAPTER VII

THE CELTIC MISSION

Oswald gains the throne of Northumbria—sends to Iona for missionaries; Aidan sent—founds the monastery of Lindisfarne, which becomes a centre of missionary work; character of Aidan; Mercia and Essex converted by Lindisfarne priests; East Anglia converted by Felix the Burgundian; Wessex converted by Wilfrid of York; the ancient British Church; Augustine's conference with British bishops—they decline to unite or to co-operate with him 52

CHAPTER VIII

THE HEPTARCHIC CHURCHES

PAGE

Missionary phase of the Church in the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms—the mode of work; Anecdotes; differences between the Italian and the Celtic religious customs 63

CHAPTER IX

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The Italian and the Celtic schools agree to unite under an archbishop; Wighard sent to Rome for consecration as archbishop—he dies at Rome; the Pope Vitalian consecrates Theodore of Tarsus; Theodore makes a visitation—holds the Council of Hertford, in which the Heptarchic Churches are combined into a united Church of England—encourages learning—subdivides dioceses—initiates parochial division; our constitution in Church and State; formation of the Province of York; the Danish invasion, and conversion; summary view of the Anglo-Saxon Church; present Church property acquired in the Saxon period 70

CHAPTER X

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPACY

Corruption of the Continental Churches in the 9th and 10th centuries; a spirit of reform springs up in the Roman Church—Popes put themselves at the head of it—Hildebrand the soul of the party—becomes Pope Gregory VII.; the theory of the spiritual supremacy founded on the forged Decretals; the theory of the Theocracy started by Gregory VII. 84

CHAPTER XI

THE NORMAN CONQUEST

Little intercourse between the Saxon Church and the rest of the world—the Norman Conquest throws it open; consti-

PAGE

tutional changes in the Church made by William the Conqueror; Gregory VII.'s demand of homage—William's reply; Lanfranc's life—Prior of Bec—Abbot of St. Stephen's, Caen—made Archbishop of Canterbury; summary of changes introduced at the Norman Conquest 91

CHAPTER XII

THE QUARREL OF INVESTITURE

Ancient mode of appointing bishops; Charlemagne introduces royal investiture; Gregory VII. opposes lay investiture; quarrel between the Pope and the Emperor; Rufus king; archbishopric of Canterbury vacant; St. Anselm—his life—Prior and Abbot of Bec—appointed archbishop; the king and archbishop quarrel; Anselm goes to Rome; on the death of Rufus, Henry I. welcomes Anselm back; Anselm refuses lay investiture; protracted dispute; compromise, which leaves the substantial victory with the king; the present mode of appointing English bishops 101

CHAPTER XIII

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON

Henry II. reduces the kingdom to order—establishes his jurisdiction over the people—desires to abolish the privilege of clergy; Becket—his birth—made chancellor—made archbishop—opposes the king's plan; the Council of Clarendon; the archbishop's exile—reconciliation with the king—return to England—murdered in his cathedral 112

CHAPTER XIV

THE POPE'S VASSAL

The archbishopric vacant; King John nominates John de Grey; part of the Chapter secretly elect Reginald the sub-prior; the matter referred to the Pope, Innocent III.—he sets aside both candidates, and nominates Stephen Langton; the king refuses to admit him to the kingdom; the Pope lays the

PAGE

kingdom under interdict; the king persecutes the clergy and seizes the property of the Church; the Pope excommunicates the king; Philip of France gathers an army to invade the kingdom and depose John; John collects the forces of the kingdom; John submits, surrenders his kingdom to the Pope, and receives it back as his vassal; Reign of Henry III.; the Pope's plunder of the Church; mandates; provisors; foreigners intruded into English benefices . . 124

CHAPTER XV

THE MONKS

The Ascetic life; the Egyptian Hermits; the *Laura;* the Community life; the monastery; the Celtic and Anglo-Saxon monasteries; the Rule of St. Benedict; the Reformed Orders; the sites of monasteries; Clairvaux; Fountains; beneficial influence of the monasteries; appropriation of benefices; its evil results on the parochial system . . 132

CHAPTER XVI

THE FRIARS

Mediæval towns; foundations of the Orders of Friars; Dominican; Franciscan; their early beneficial influence; Deterioration; evil results on the Parochial system . . . 146

CHAPTER XVII

FALSE DOCTRINES AND SUPERSTITIOUS PRACTICES OF THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH

Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the Immaculate Conception; *Mariolatry;* Mediatrix; the theory of *Transubstantiation* started by Paschasius Radbert—opposed by Ratramnus—opposed by Berengarius—defended by Lanfranc—defined in the Council of the Lateran; the Cup withheld from the laity; the sacrificial aspect exaggerated; sacramental aspect obscured; reservation; *Purgatory; Indulgences; Saint Worship* 150

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY: SKETCH OF THE CHURCH IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

PAGE

The country; villages; cathedrals; towns; monasteries; the Church on the side of the people; morality of the people; parochial work and teaching; Chaucer's Parish Priest . . 163

CHAPTER XIX

THE REACTION

Grostête, Bishop of Lincoln—opposes abuses; Edward I.'s Law against Provisors; his Parliament opposes Papal pretensions; Papal exactions; Edward III.'s Statute of Provisors; appeals to Rome forbidden; tribute to Rome withheld; Parliamentary remonstrance; Wiclif; Parliamentary proposals for Reform in the time of Henry IV.; Richard II.'s Statute of Præmunire 177

CHAPTER XX

THE REFORMATION: THE REPUDIATION OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY

Councils of Constance and Basle; Wolsey; Henry VIII., his marriage; question of the divorce; act of submission; title of Head of the Church *tantum per Christi legem licet;* Cranmer pronounces the king's marriage void; repudiation of the Papal supremacy by the king and the Convocation . 185

CHAPTER XXI

THE REFORMATION: SUPPRESSION OF THE REGULAR CLERGY AND DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES

Dissolution of some by Wolsey; suppression of the smaller Houses by the Act of 1535; the enforced surrender of the great Houses; Glastonbury; the Second Act of Suppression, 1540; foundation of new sees; foundation of new families . 196

CHAPTER XXII

THE DOCTRINAL REFORMATION

PAGE

The Ten Articles; 'The Institution of a Christian Man;' the Act of Six Articles; 'The Necessary Doctrine for any Christian Man;' reform of the Breviary; publication of the Bible; mediæval versions of the Bible; the Bible the Rule of Faith; the Church's authority in controversies of faith; Coverdale's Bible placed in the churches; Cranmer's Bible 203

CHAPTER XXIII

THE FOREIGN ELEMENT IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

Edward VI.; suppression of the chantries; plunder of Church property; suppression of ancient ceremonies; destruction of 'Images'; history of the Liturgy of the Church; First Prayer Book of Edward VI.; influence of foreign Reformers; Second Prayer Book of Edward VI.; bishops persecuted; merits of the Reformation—it was a Reformation of the Church by itself—its wisdom and moderation; defects of the Reformation—it pulled down but failed to build up—plunder of Church property—loss of Church discipline 212

CHAPTER XXIV

THE MARIAN PERSECUTION

Deposed bishops restored, and reforming bishops deposed; foreign Protestants leave the country with some English; Parliament repeals the Reform legislation; the Church reconciled to Rome; attempt to secure conformity by persecution; martyrdom of Ridley and Latimer—of Cranmer . 225

CHAPTER XXV

THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE REFORMATION

Elizabeth's accession; position of parties; Parker; Papal supremacy again repudiated; Act of Uniformity passed;

PAGE

Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. adopted with alterations; bishops who refuse to take the Oath of Supremacy deposed; Parker consecrated archbishop; the "Nag's Head Fable"; the Pope's offer to recognize the Reformation if the Church will acknowledge his supremacy; the Pope excommunicates the queen; the Popish Schism; the Puritan agitation 234

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PURITANS

Calvinism; Arminianism; the Synod of Dort; Puritanism predominant in the Church of England; the Anglo-Catholic revival 246

CHAPTER XXVII

THE GREAT REBELLION

Charles I.'s accession; political situation; the Puritans ally themselves with the Parliamentary party; the Anglo-Catholics support the king; the Long Parliament; the king accepts constitutional principles and redresses grievances; Strafford's execution; Cavaliers and Roundheads; Civil War; Parliament victorious over the king; Cromwell disperses Parliament and seizes power; Committee of Religion attacks the clergy; the Assembly of Divines; the Solemn League and Covenant; murder of Archbishop Laud; Prayer Book suppressed; Presbyterianism established; Presbyterians refuse toleration to Independents; summary of the political and religious situation; Independency in the ascendant 253

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE CLERGY

The Committee of Religion—persecutes the clergy—ejects them from their benefices and imprisons them; mob violence; cases of Mr. Sefton; Mr. Phare; Mr. Tarleton; Mr.

PAGE

Tyllot; Mr. Buck; Mr. Sterne; Mr. Powell; Mr. Honifield; Mr. Wild; Mr. Weyborough; Mr. Whitby; Mr. Randall; Mr. Clark 265

CHAPTER XXIX

THE RESTORATION

Cromwell's despotism—his death; Monk marches to London—reassembles Parliament—proclaims Charles II.; the Savoy Conference; Act of Uniformity: holders of Church livings required to be episcopally ordained and to accept the Prayer Book, or to retire; the Five Mile Act; the Conventicle Act; the Test Act; the king's Declaration of Indulgence—withdrawn 277

CHAPTER XXX

THE REVOLUTION

James II.'s design to restore Romanism—officers the army with Romanists—allows perverts still to hold their benefices; mass set up in two colleges in Oxford; High Court of Commission revived; Declaration of Indulgence; bishops petition against the Declaration—are sent to the Tower, tried, acquitted; the clergy refuse to read the Declaration; William of Orange invited over; the king's flight; William and Mary; the Bill of Rights 285

CHAPTER XXXI

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

The principles of toleration held to be culpable; all the religious parties persecuted in turn—Henry, Mary, Elizabeth, James, Charles, the Romanists, the Puritans, the Anglo-Catholics, the Presbyterians, the Independents; opinions of Baxter, Edwardes, the Nonconformist ministers; the Independents in New England; persecution of Ultra-Calvinists, of Quakers, of Roman Catholics; the Toleration Act; progress of toleration under the Church of England; assault of Dissent upon the Church; Papists and Independents still intolerant . . 294

CHAPTER XXXII

THE MODERN PERIOD

PAGE

Condition of religion at the end of the 18th century; the Evangelical Revival—its characteristics—its defects; the Anglican Revival—its origin, theology, ecclesiology, characteristics, results—its dangers; the increase of Dissent; the Administrative Revival; Tithe Commutation; Ecclesiastical Commission; Church Building Acts; new parishes; restoration of churches; parsonage houses; hamlet chapels; mission rooms; increase of numbers of clergy; new sees; suffragan bishops; women's work; educational work . . 304

CHAPTER XXXIII

DISSENT

Independents: Theories of Church government—Republican theory—establish a politico-religious sect—persecuted—flee to Holland—their extravagances—obtain power in England under Cromwell—their conduct. *Roman Catholics* secede from the Church in 1570—political character of their schism—persecuted; Catholic emancipation; the Papal aggression; the Immaculate Conception; Papal infallibility. *Anabaptists:* early Anabaptists—modern sect a secession from the Independents in 1633—their tenets, history. *Wesleyans:* John Wesley; G. Whitfield—form a society at Oxford—principles—encouraged by the bishops; Wesley's voyage to Georgia—adopts new doctrines and practices from the Moravians—discountenanced by the Church authorities; meeting-houses built; split between Arminian and Calvinistic Methodists—latter under Whitfield become a sect; first Wesleyan Conference in 1744; Deed of Declaration, 1784; Wesley opposes the usurpation of the ministry by his lay preachers, and the separation of his societies from the Church—soon after his death Conference formally secedes from the Church and preachers usurp the administration of quasi-sacraments—subdivisions of the sect; conclusion . 313

TURNING POINTS

OF

ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY

CHAPTER I

BRITANNIA

Look at an ancient map of Europe. At the date of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ the blue, sunny, tideless Mediterranean Sea was what its name implied—the Sea in the middle of the World; for all the principal nations of the world lay around it — Italy, Greece, Syria, Judea, Egypt, Libya, Spain, Gaul; all the great cities were on its coasts—Rome, Athens, Corinth, Ephesus, Antioch, Alexandria. And all these nations of Southern Europe and Western Asia and Northern Africa had become subject to the power of Imperial Rome. Outside the Pillars of Hercules, bounding the western side of the world, was the stormy outer ocean, with its mysterious tides and vast waves, a wild waste of waters stretching no one knew how far toward the north and south and west. The Island of Britain, which lay in this outer ocean, beyond the coasts of Gaul, was looked upon as lying outside the world: *toto divisos orbe Britannos.*

Julius Cæsar made this island known to the rest of the world. Seeking some new exploit with which he

might dazzle the imagination of the Romans, he projected the conquest of Britain. In the year 55 B.C., he gathered together the shipping of the Gallic harbours, carried two legions and a small body of horse across the strait, and effected a landing on the opposite shore in spite of brave opposition. But his force was insufficient for conquest; he could not venture to move out of reach of his entrenched camp and fleet. He repulsed, however, an attack on his camp, sallied out and inflicted a severe defeat on his assailants, and then gladly accepted their offers of peace, and withdrew his troops before the winter came. This first expedition was little more than a reconnaisance in force. Before he returned to Rome he left orders with his lieutenants in Gaul to make all preparations for an invasion of Britain on a greater scale in the following spring.

Cæsar was an historian as well as a statesman and a general, and wrote a history of this war, from which we derive nearly all we know of the condition at that period of Britain and the Britons. A comparison of the Britain of those times with the New Zealand of our own will help the reader to realize its condition. The land was for the most part covered with forest, such as in New Zealand and Australia we call bush. The climate consequently was more humid than now, and the unrestrained rivers flooded wide tracts of land after every rain, and formed great marshes in the lowlands, and drained into numerous meres. These forests, meres, and marshes harboured wolves, bears, wild boars, wild cattle, deer, fox, wild cat, otter, badger, beaver, and game of many sorts which can find no shelter now in a land which has only a corner here and there left in its native wildness.

The island was chiefly inhabited by two Celtic races, the Gaels and the Britons, each divided into numerous

tribes. These Celtic races inhabited the interior and the north and west of the island, wandering from place to place with their cattle without any settled habitations. A more civilized race, allied to the Belgians of the opposite coasts, inhabited the sea-board from the Humber to Devonshire, stretching inward so far, perhaps, as to occupy the modern counties of Hertford, Buckingham, and Berks. They had "towns"—portions of forest surrounded by a stockade, like the New Zealand "pahs"—within which their cattle could be driven for safety. Two or three great roads traversed the south of the country; they may have been little more than trackways across hill and down, crossing the rivers at fords, with clearings cut through the forests, but their existence indicates a degree of intercourse among the different tribes. The Britons tilled the land as well as kept cattle; they carried on some commerce with Gaul; they had a coinage in silver and gold, and a written language; they trained horses and drove chariots, which they used also with scythed wheels in war.

From Cæsar and Pliny, with what modern research has gleaned from other sources, we learn something about their religion.

The Druids formed a sacred caste among them. What we know of the Druids leads to the conclusion that in some past time a number of men of higher race and in a more advanced state of civilization came among the ruder tribes of Britain, and were received with the veneration with which the Peruvians and Mexicans 300 years ago, and the Pacific Islanders of later times, looked up to their first European visitors. The Druids, however, would seem to have been a community of priests or philosophers rather than of ambitious soldiers or mercenary traders, and contented themselves with establishing

a hierarchy, conferring many blessings of religion and civilization on the people among whom they settled, and taking certain moderate privileges and advantages in return. Cæsar says: "The Druids act in all sacred matters; they attend to the sacrifices, which are offered either by the tribe in general or by individuals, and answer all questions concerning religion . . . . they decide in all controversies, whether public or private, and they judge all cases, whether of murder, of a disputed inheritance, or of the boundaries of estates. They assign both rewards and punishments, and whoever refuses to abide by their sentence is excommunicated. . . . Young men are gladly placed with them by their parents and relations to learn their doctrines. In their schools the pupils are said to learn by heart a large number of verses, and in this way some of the scholars pass twenty years in completing their education. The Druids enjoy peculiar privileges: they are exempt from service in war and from the payment of taxes; they have also many other immunities. . . . The Druidic system is thought to have had its origin in Britain, from whence it was introduced into Gaul, and it is still customary for those who wish to study it more thoroughly to pass over into Britain for that purpose." It seems probable that the system came from the East, perhaps from Northern India. The Druids had no supreme chief, and for the most part lived in communities, apparently in retired places. They wore the hair short and the beard long, dressed in a long robe, wore a "serpent's egg," enclosed in gold, suspended from the neck, and bore a staff. In their secret teaching they are said to have taught the initiated to believe in one God, but the popular religion had a number of gods (to whom Cæsar gives the names of the classical divinities), and the mountains, lakes,

rivers, trees, and fountains had their several divinities. They taught the immortality of the soul. Their religious rites consisted chiefly of sacrifices, which on extraordinary occasions were of human victims. Cæsar tells us that on some great national occasions they made immense images of wicker-work, which they filled with men, who were thus burnt alive in offering to their deities.[1] They professed to divine the future. They seem to have used open-air temples surrounded by a grove of oaks, or enclosed by upright stones arranged in circles, with which are sometimes connected winding avenues of upright stones, as at Stonehenge and Avebury in Wiltshire, and at Carnac in Brittany. Pliny tells us of their veneration for the oak, and the mistletoe which grows upon the oak, and of the ceremonial with which it was gathered in their new-year solemnities. They had midsummer rites connected with the veneration of fire, and other rites connected with the harvest in May and October.

It is curious to observe how tenacious of life the customs of a people are. It is 2000 years since Druidism was driven out of the land, and yet traces of Druidical superstitions and observances continued from age to age. In the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries there were numerous edicts of emperors, and canons of councils, against the worship of the sun and moon, of mountains, rivers, lakes, and trees. Even in the 11th century a law of Canute

[1] A recent writer points out that if these images of wicker-work were upright figures, as they are represented in the imaginary illustrations of our school histories, the lower part would be at once burnt, and the image would fall down, and there would be a scramble for life among the liberated victims. He suggests that they may have been such images as the gigantic figures traced out in the turf of some of our hills, like the White Horse in Berkshire, and the Long Man at Wilmington, near Hastings: and that these spaces were enclosed by hurdles within which the sacrifices took place.

shows us that the local veneration for the old sacred springs and trees, and superstitious observances connected with them, still remained. And even to the present day the universal use of mistletoe as a decoration of our houses at Christmas time, and the social customs attached to it, are a tradition of its Druidical use and meaning; while the fact that it is never used for the Christmas decoration of churches indicates that the early Christian teachers would not allow the symbol of the false religion to be introduced into the Christian temples.

The next year, 54 B.C., great preparations having been made in the meantime, Cæsar came again to Britain with five legions and 2000 horse, in a fleet of 800 vessels, prepared for conquest. The Britons, also, had not been idle; they had united their forces under Cassivellaunus, the most powerful king in the south of the island; and they gave the finest troops and the greatest general in the world very considerable trouble and anxiety. In the end, after a campaign of about five months, the greater part of the south of the island was compelled to submit. But Cæsar did not retain possession of the country. The Britons gave hostages, and promised a tribute, which seems to have been very irregularly paid; and their bravery secured for them nearly another century of practical independence of the Roman yoke.

The islands, however, were thus made known and opened up to intercourse with the Roman world. The British chiefs and upper classes began to adopt the Roman civilization. Britons began to visit Rome, and strangers came to visit Britain. A more active commerce sprang up with the Continent, and London began to be noted as the emporium of that commerce.

It was near 100 years after, in the year 43 A.D., that the conquest of the island was again undertaken by the

Emperor Claudius. He did not find the conquest an easy one; the progress of the Roman arms met with an obstinate resistance; conquered tribes frequently broke out into rebellion, and sometimes inflicted heavy reverses on their enemies. It took forty years before the conquest was complete, and then Northern Britain successfully resisted the power of Rome. It was only those parts of the island which constitute England and Wales and the lowlands of Scotland, which were finally annexed to the Roman Empire. A chain of forts from the Forth to the Clyde was erected to protect these conquests from the turbulent northern tribes. Hadrian, after repressing their incursions, drew back the frontier line to the isthmus between the Solway and the Tyne, and erected the more formidable barrier of a stone wall strengthened by forts and stations. A little later Antoninus once more pushed forward the frontier to the old line of the more northern isthmus and strengthened it with an earthen wall.

The conquerors proceeded without delay, according to their usual policy, to civilize their new acquisition. They built cities adorned with forums, temples, and theatres. Many of these cities were fortified, and were connected by noble high-roads, with convenient Stations (*i. e.* post-stations) at regular distances. Roman capitalists invested largely in British agriculture; the land was extensively cultivated, and soon exported great quantities of corn to Rome; the Villas of the great landed proprietors, which have their counterpart in the Estancias of South America, or more remotely in the Stations of Australian and African settlers, were scattered over the south of the country. They established manufactures, worked mines, promoted commerce, and cultivated the fine arts. The upper classes of the Britons adopted the new civilization, dressed and lived like Romans, spoke Latin, and inter-

mixed with the conquerors. In short, the Britons became Romanized; and for 350 years, a period as long as from the Reformation to the present day, Britain was a province of the Roman Empire.

This province was ultimately divided into five departments: Britannia Prima, Britannia Secunda, Flavia Cæsariensis, Maxima Cæsariensis, and Valentia. The first of these consisted of the whole south of the island up to the Thames and the Bristol Channel. The second coincided with the modern principality of Wales. Flavia comprised the middle of the island from the Thames to the Humber and the Mersey. North of this, to a distance of twenty-five miles beyond Hadrian's Wall, was the Maxima Cæsariensis, and Valentia coincided with the lowlands of Scotland. We have the names of thirty-three cities and towns of various rank and importance scattered all over the province. These towns had municipal institutions and formed each a little self-governing republic. There was an elaborately organized civil government, extending its ramifications over the province. There was a distinct military organization. Three legions formed a permanent garrison, the 6th at York, the 20th at Chester,[1] and the 2nd at Caerleon; the northern frontier and the east and south coasts were guarded by a chain of military settlements of irregulars. These troops were not changed from time to time, but occupied the same stations permanently, with wives and families, forming military colonies rather than garrisons.

The religion of the province of Britannia was that of the rest of the empire. Claudius proscribed the Druids, who were forthwith driven out of the province. The rude

[1] This was withdrawn from the island in the latter part of the Roman period.

grandeur of the stone circles and the religious gloom of the oak groves were superseded by elegant classical temples of Jupiter and Apollo; the foreign settlers and the mercenaries, who were recruited from all parts of the world, introduced their native superstitions; but many of the people, no doubt, still clung to the proscribed religion, and still paid superstitious reverence to stone circles and oak groves and sacred fountains.

CHAPTER II

THE BRITISH CHURCH

WHO first preached the Gospel in Britain? When and by whom was the Church of Christ first planted here? The sketch of ancient Britain, and its reduction to a Roman province, in the last chapter, have been introduced in order to place us in a condition to give an intelligent consideration to the numerous conflicting answers to these questions.

Some naturally desire to claim St. Paul as the Apostle of Britain, and they adduce evidence to show the probability of the claim. There are eight years of St. Paul's life, between his first and second imprisonments at Rome, during which the Acts of the Apostles fails to reveal to us the scene of his apostolic labours. When we look to the early Christian writers in the hope of being able to fill up the gap, we are tantalized by vague general phrases which do not assert that St. Paul visited Britain, and do not exclude the possibility of such a visit. Clement of Rome, who was contemporary with the Apostle, tells us that he extended his labours to the "utmost bounds of the west." This is a phrase in which writers of the time often included Britain; but it is a vague rhetorical phrase, which would be equally true if St. Paul had not done more than fulfil the intention he expressed in his letter to the Romans (chap. xv.) of travelling into Spain. Tertullian says that the Gospel had already (200 A.D.) penetrated into parts of Britain not subject to the Roman power.

Other vague expressions of a similar kind occur in Jerome, A.D. 390, and in Theodoret, A.D. 423. Eusebius, the historian of the early Church, A.D. 325, after speaking of the spreading of the Gospel among the Romans, Persians, Armenians, Parthians, Indians, and Scythians, adds that "some passed over the ocean to those which are called the British Isles." Venantius Fortunatus, A.D. 560, and Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 560, are usually quoted as the first who expressly state that St. Paul visited Britain. But Fortunatus only says that the *teaching* of St. Paul, *stylus ille*, spread to Britain and *Ultima Thule:* he limits St. Paul's personal travels to Illyricum. Sophronius is quoted by the Magdeburg centuriators and others as bringing St. Paul in person to Britain, but there is nothing to that effect in the printed fragments of Sophronius, and (says Mr. Haddan [1]) his authority is worthless if there were. There is, in short, no authority earlier than the Welsh Triads, whose date is more than a thousand years later, for supposing that there was any special local veneration for St. Paul in Britain; and there is absolutely no authority whatever for the supposition that the Apostle ever personally visited these islands.

We all remember the interesting story which Tacitus tells us of Caractacus, the leader of the confederate armies of the Britons against the invasion of Claudius, that, when he was carried prisoner to Rome and saw its magnificence, he exclaimed, "How is it that the possessors of so much magnificence could envy me my cottage in Britain?" and that he made so eloquent an appeal to Claudius that the Emperor set him at liberty. The Welsh Triads (collected in the 13th century, but conveying the traditions of an earlier time) assert that Bran, the father of Caractacus, being left seven years in Rome as a hostage for his son,

[1] Haddan and Stubbs's 'Concilia.'

was converted to Christianity, and carried the faith back with him to Britain. The fact that St. Paul's imprisonment in Rome coincided with the last two years of that of the father of Caractacus gives occasion to a lively imagination to conjecture that the Druid priest (for so he was) may have been converted to the faith by the Apostle of the Gentiles. But we cannot accept the story as history; it is inconsistent with Tacitus and Dio Cassius, and it rests solely on the testimony of the Welsh Triads.

The Glastonbury thorn, which blossoms at Christmas, was for many centuries accepted as a miraculous testimony to the legend of the place that Joseph of Arimathea, after a sojourn in Gaul, came, accompanied by Lazarus and his sisters Martha and Mary, bringing with him the holy grail,[1] and preached the Gospel in the Isle of Avalon, and confirmed his preaching by striking into the ground his staff of thorn, which forthwith broke out, like Aaron's rod, into leaf and blossom, and grew into a tree, which always blossomed at the same Christmas season. But when we come to examine the evidence of the story, it turns out to be of post-Norman date: William of Malmesbury is the earliest authority for any part of it. And though Glastonbury is an ancient British foundation, and perhaps one of the earliest Christian settlements in the island, yet the story of its foundation by Joseph of Arimathea is purely mythical.

Another legend says that we owe our Christianity to Lucius, King of the Britons, who in the 2nd century, having heard of Christianity, sent an embassy to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, asking to have the Gospel sent to him and his people; and that his ambassadors, having been instructed and consecrated, returned and founded a

[1] The vessel in which our Lord consecrated the Eucharist.

Church here. The historical critic traces the origin and growth of the story. The *Catalogus Pontificum Romanorum* was originally written shortly after the year 353, and in it is recorded the name of Eleutherius, and the date of his pontificate. In the year 530 this catalogue had considerable additions made to it, and among these additions is a note under the entry of Eleutherius's name, that in his time Lucius, King of Britain, was converted. Gildas, A.D. 560, the great authority for the history of the British Church, makes no mention of Lucius. Bede, in the 8th century, introduced the story into England. Nennius, in the 9th century, expanded the story into the conversion of the whole of Britain. Between that time and the 12th century it came to be connected with North Wales. The Book of Llandaff (a compilation of the 12th century) gives the names of Lucius's ambassadors, and tells us where they founded their sees. The whole story rests on the interpolated note in the Catalogue of Roman Pontiffs, and cannot be received as historical.

It is well that we should know these stories: they are the myths of our early ecclesiastical history; they enter into our English literature; but none of them can be accepted as anything more than legendary stories. In mediæval times there was a theological motive for encouraging the belief that Rome had special claims on the gratitude and obedience of the Christian world; and in more modern days there was an equal motive for trying to show that we owe our Christianity to St. Paul and not to the representatives of St. Peter. Our business is to guard ourselves against all prepossessions, to sift all legendary histories, and to endeavour to arrive at the truth.

We have seen that, after the invasion of Julius Cæsar,

the island was opened up to intercourse with the rest of the world, and that after the conquest of Claudius it became an integral part of the empire. Still the chief intercourse between Britain and the civilized world was through Gaul, and there are many reasons for believing that Christianity came to us through that channel. In Gaul a few scattered churches were planted from 150 A.D. to 170 A.D., of which Lyons was the chief; and they did not extend far northward from that city. The Christianizing of Gaul as a whole is due to a great missionary effort in the time of Decius, about 250 A.D.; and the historical probability is that, though there may have been isolated believers in Britain previous to that time, yet the planting of the Church in Britain was not earlier than that date.

The only remaining legend which we need to mention and to investigate is that of St. Alban. The legend as it is told by Bede is as follows:—During the Diocletian persecution (304 A.D.), Alban, a citizen of Verulamium, sheltered in his house a priest who was fleeing from his persecutors. The sight of the good man's life, his watchings and prayers, impressed his entertainer's mind, and he became a convert. After some days it became known where the priest was concealed, and soldiers were sent to seize him; but Alban put on the priest's dress, and allowed himself to be taken, while the priest made his escape. On being brought before the judge he was ordered to sacrifice to the gods, but, refusing and declaring himself to be a Christian, he was ordered to execution. The place of execution was a grassy hill at some little distance outside the city walls, and divided from it by a river. The people of the city rushed out in such numbers to witness the martyrdom that the bridge over the river was crowded and made impassable; whereupon Alban, impatient for the crown of martyrdom, walked to the

river bank, and the waters opened, like those of Jordan, and made a dry road for the party to pass over. The executioner, seeing this, threw down his sword and declared himself converted to the Christian faith. Arrived at the summit of the hill, Alban prayed for water to quench his thirst, and immediately a fountain burst forth from the earth. One of the soldiers at length struck off the martyr's head, and his own eyes fell upon the ground together with the victim's head. The converted executioner was beheaded also at the same time. Then the judge, astonished at these miracles, ordered the persecution to cease. When the Church had peace under Constantine, a church was built on the spot, which existed in Bede's time. There in 793 King Offa founded a monastery, which was destroyed by the Danes. The noble Abbey Church, founded in the 12th century on the site of its predecessor, is still one of the most interesting churches in England. The mediæval town of St. Albans gradually grew up about the monastery, and the ruined walls of deserted Verulam are still to be seen half-a-mile off across the little river.

There are some discrepancies between the narrative and the known history of the times which throw a shadow of doubt over it. But the tradition was known at the time (429 A.D.) that Germanus and Lupus visited England; for we read that Germanus paid a visit to the site of the martyrdom; and the history is not in its general outline improbable; so that we shall probably be safe in accepting that St. Alban did suffer death in the Diocletian persecution; and we may continue to honour him as the proto-martyr of Britain.

At length, at the date A.D. 314, we arrive at an historical fact, on which we can stand as on a rock; and from which we can look back and draw some safe deduc-

tions as to the previous years. In that year, A.D. 314, a council was summoned to meet at Arles to consider the question of the Donatist schism in Africa; and in the Acts of the Council we find recorded the names of three British bishops who sat in the council, attended by a priest and a deacon. They were—(1) Eborius, Bishop of York; (2) Restitutus, Bishop of London; (3) Adelfius, Bishop of *Colonia Lodinensium*, which has been variously conjectured to be Colchester, Lincoln, and Caerleon-on-Usk;[1] (4) Sacerdos, a priest; (5) Arminius, a deacon.

We have, then, the certain fact that at the beginning of the 4th century there were Christian Churches established in cities of the British Province; that they had the constitution of diocesan bishops, priests, and deacons; and that they were in full communion with the rest of the Church of Christ. Standing on this rock, we look around and conjecture that these three bishops were only representatives of the British Church, and that there were other bishops in others of the cities of Britain. We look back, and conclude that a Church thus spread over the land from York to London, and from London to Caerleon, and thus fully organized, and recognized by the other Churches of the world, was not a new thing which had sprung up in a night; it must have been the work of years.

Again, there were British bishops at the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, who joined in the condemnation of Arius. And still again at the Council of Ariminum, in A.D. 360. The Emperor had ordered apartments to be allotted to the clergy attending this council, and all their

[1] The probability is that Adelfius was of Caerleon; this would make them bishops of the capital cities of three of the provinces into which Roman Britain was then divided, and it would be correct at this special period of Constantine the Great to place York as the first in rank. (Haddan and Stubbs.)

expenses to be paid; but it was deemed unbecoming to accept this bounty on the part of the Aquitanians, Gauls, and Britons, who preferred to take the expenses of the journey on themselves; but Sulpicius Severus adds, "Three only of those from Britain, on account of poverty, made use of the public gift, rejecting the contributions offered by the other bishops, because they considered it more proper to burden the treasury than individuals."

In the middle of the 4th century the British Churches signified by letter to Athanasius their adhesion to the Nicene faith. In the latter part of the 4th century (386—400), extracts from the writings of Chrysostom, Jerome, and Sozomen show satisfactorily that there was a settled Church in Britain, with churches, altars, scriptures, and discipline, holding intercourse both with Rome and Palestine.

At the beginning of the 5th century the British Church was troubled with the heresy of Pelagius. Pelagius himself was perhaps a native of Britain (his name, *Pelagius*, is a Grecized form of *Morgan*), and this may account for his doctrines becoming popular here. They seem to have spread to such an extent, and to have been so influentially supported, that the orthodox party found it desirable to send to the Church of Gaul in A.D. 429, to ask for help to combat the heresy. The Gallican Church summoned a synod, which deputed two of its greatest men—Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes—to go into Britain and confirm it in the faith. At a synod which seems to have been held at or near Verulam, their arguments and their authority silenced the heretical party for a time; but the heresy seems to have revived, since in A.D. 447 Germanus and Severus, afterwards Bishop of Trèves (Lupus having

died in the meantime), paid a second visit to Britain on a similar errand.

The traditions recorded by Geoffrey of Monmouth speak as if Christianity became the religion of the people generally. They tell us of three archbishops presiding over the three provinces into which the country was divided, and twenty-eight bishops in the principal cities, who were amply provided for by the endowments of the old heathen priests, together with the offerings of the new converts; and they would lead us to conclude that the old heathenism lingered on only in the remote corners of the land. Mr. Haddan says: "The general tenor of Geoffrey of Monmouth's history (obvious fable apart) is in accordance with probability so far as regards the fortunes and acts of the British Church, its details are wholly untrustworthy." But of late years the archæologists have brought evidence against these traditions. They assure us that among the vast number of relics of Roman times which remain on the Continent, there is a fair proportion of Christian relics, such as monumental inscriptions, and articles of ornament and domestic use marked with the cross or other Christian symbol; but that among the Roman relics found plentifully enough in England there is a remarkable absence of such traces of Christianity; that, on the other hand, the Roman relics in our museums include a great number and variety of pagan altars and other symbols of heathenism, which prove that heathenism extensively prevailed. And these facts, they say, unless they can be accounted for in some other way, must be taken as a proof that there were few Christians, at least among the better classes of society, among the classes for whose tastes the manufacturers of ornaments and utensils cater while they are alive, and to whose memory monuments are erected after they are dead.

Perhaps the traditions and the archæological deductions may be harmonized. It may be that the Welsh traditions give a picture of the Church which the heathen Saxons swept away, coloured by the natural exaggerations of regret; that British churches did exist in the chief cities, but that their members were of the lower classes of the town populations; and that heathenism still held its ground, and the old classical temples were still frequented by fashionable worshippers. In the country districts it is not improbable that the classical heathenisms still prevailed among the wealthy and isolated landowners, and obscure local cults among the masses of their half-civilized serfs. But that the Gospel was preached in this country in the 2nd century is probable, and that the Christian Church was established by the end of the 3rd century at latest, the facts which we have above related put beyond all question.[1]

[1] Mr. Haddan, in his most valuable collection of documents relating to the Church of England, quotes historical notices of the existence of British churches at Canterbury (two in number), Caerleon (two), Bangor Iscoed near Chester, Glastonbury, Whithern, in Galloway, and near Evesham; and notes existing remains or traces of others at Dover Castle, Richborough, Reculver, Lyminge, and Brixworth. He notes Christian sepulchral monuments at St. Mary-le-Wigford, Lincoln, with a Christian inscription; at Caerleon with palm branch; a sarcophagus at Barming; a stone with Christian symbols at Bath. Other remains—pottery with the cross and monogram at Padstow, Cornwall; Samian ware with monogram at Catterick, Yorkshire; a silver cup with monograms at Corbridge, Northumberland; a cross on the pavement of a villa at Harpole, Hants; a pavement with monogram in a villa at Frampton, Dorset; a pavement with a cross at Horkstow, Lincolnshire; two tiles with monogram in a villa at Chedworth, Gloucestershire; a coin of Decentius, brother of Magnentius, one of the many who usurped the purple in Britain, with a monogram between α and ω; pins with cross heads found in London; a human figure with a glory at Ilkley, Yorkshire; metal stamps with monogram, &c., found in the Thames; to which may be added the medallion of a hair-pin with head of Constantine looking upwards at the ☧ monogram found in London, and a bone pin with cross head found at Colchester.

We naturally look to the history of the Welsh Church for additional information on the previous history of the Church in Roman Britain. A critical examination of the materials rejects much of the legendary details, but, on the other hand, it leaves a residuum of facts which is very valuable. As soon as the history of Wales emerges from the darkness which conceals it for a century after the departure of the Romans, we find a diocesan episcopate established there, with a monastic establishment as the centre of each see, apparently newly arranged to correspond with the Principalities into which Wales had been newly divided, and without any archiepiscopate.

The earlier post-Reformation writers on English Church history believed that they found evidences in the early history of the British Church that it had derived its Christianity directly from an Oriental source. But the latest writers on the subject assure us that this is an erroneous deduction from facts which are to be otherwise explained. "The early British Church," says Mr. Haddan, "was in no other sense Oriental than that its Christianity originated, like all Christianity, in Asia, and found its way to Britain through (most probably) Lyons, and not through the then equally Greek Church of Rome, but without imprinting one single trace upon the British Church itself of any one thing in a peculiar sense Greek or Oriental." The mode of computing Easter was not the Greek as distinguished from the Roman mode; it was (though really of earlier date) the cycle called by the name of Sulpicius Severus, a disciple of St. Martin of Tours, which had been adopted by the Western Churches, and which continued to be used by the British Church after the continental Churches had adopted the more correct cycle of Victorius Aquitanus. The tonsure was

neither Greek nor Roman, but peculiar to the British and Scottish Churches.

But if modern criticism establishes the fact that these peculiarities are not proofs of a direct Eastern origin for the British Church, it leaves them equally evidences of customs different from those of Rome; and it adds other evidences of the independence of the British Church of still greater interest and value: the absence of an archiepiscopate in the British Church from the beginning down to the end of the period of Welsh independence, *i. e.* at the earliest, down to the 12th century; the consecration of bishops by a single bishop; peculiar rites in the consecration of deacons and priests different from those of other Churches; a peculiarity in the mode of administering baptism (it consisted probably in single instead of trine immersion); a custom in the consecration of churches and monasteries, the chief point being the dedication not to some departed saint but to the living founder.[1] There are indications that the British Church had a liturgy peculiar to itself; and still more, that it had a Latin version of the Bible, founded on the old Latin, and different from the Vulgate, peculiar to itself. We do not, perhaps, need these evidences that the British Church was independent of Rome; there is no shadow of pretence for assuming any such dependence. The true historical value and interest of these facts is that they show an unexpected vigour of initiation in the British Church, and probably indicate a greater isolation from the Churches of the Continent than we should have anticipated.

[1] Some of these are noted by Maskell in the early Anglo-Saxon Church, and especially the Northumbrian branch of it; one of them was certainly borrowed from the British Church, and the rest most probably were so.

CHAPTER III

THE SAXON CONQUEST

At the beginning of the 5th century after Christ the Roman Empire was in a different condition from that in which the opening of our first chapter described it. Then it had grasped nearly the whole of the civilized countries of the known world, and, in the very wantonness of power and feverish thirst for new achievements, crossed the ocean to add to its conquests this barbarous island outside the civilized world. At the time of which we now speak the Empire had grown old and feeble; it was distracted by rebellions and usurpations, and the barbarians had grown strong and bold, and made attacks on the frontiers which it demanded all the power of the failing giant to repel.

At length the Emperor Honorius determined to abandon some of the more distant provinces of the empire in order to concentrate his resources for the defence of the rest. In the year 410 A.D., he withdrew from this island the staff of Imperial officers who had carried on the civil government, and the 20,000 troops who had formed its garrison, leaving the inhabitants to form a government of their own and provide for their own safety. This exclusion of Britain from the Empire helped to give it in after ages a peculiar independence of the rest of Europe, as will be seen in the sequel of the history.

The history of the Saxon conquest is not told us by

any contemporary historian; the traditions preserved by later writers are scanty and not very lucid; but by help of these traditions, eked out by the deductions which archæology has drawn from the actual remains of the people, we have come to have a general notion of its history. We gather that when the Romans thus withdrew both government and garrison, an attempt was made to carry on a native government on the old lines, which soon broke in pieces; and the ensuing confusion and disputes and wars among the people left the land helpless against the incursions of the pirates from the opposite coasts of Germany. For many years previous those coasts had sent forth the surplus population for whom there was not occupation and food enough at home, in bands of hardy, reckless adventurers, who harried the sea-board of Europe, often carried their small ships with sail and oar up the rivers far inland, and sometimes formed permanent conquests and settlements. The Roman masters of the island had long maintained a fleet in the narrow seas to guard their coasts—and not always successfully—from these marauders. No wonder then that when the island was left in this distracted and defenceless condition the adventurers flocked to it like vultures to a carcass, and no wonder they in the end made a conquest of the country.

The conquest was, however, a very slow and desultory one. The first Saxons are said to have come over in 429 A.D., and the wars between the old inhabitants and the invaders were not concluded for near 200 years after. The Saxon conquest was not like the Roman conquest, systematically carried on by one great military power: it was the work of a number of unconnected efforts. Different fleets of adventurers landed on different parts of the coast; reinforcements of their countrymen followed from time to time and spread further and further inland.

Sometimes they would meet with resistance, and a battle ensued. Sometimes one of the fortified cities would offer an obstacle to the progress of the invaders, and had to be taken by siege. Slowly, but surely, the Romano-British people were driven back on all sides.

Following different independent leaders, they at last founded seven or eight independent kingdoms. The Jutes founded the kingdom of Kent. Different chiefs of the Saxon race formed the kingdom of Essex (which included the counties of Essex, Middlesex, and Herts) and the kingdom of Sussex. Three chiefs of the Angles founded the kingdom of East Anglia (whose division into Norfolk and Suffolk—North-folk and South-folk—seems to point to some original subdivision of the kingdom). The Angles founded the kingdom of Northumbria, which also was subdivided into the kingdom of Bernicia north of the Tees, and Deira between the Tees and Humber, kindred states, sometimes held by independent princes, and sometimes united in one hand. The kingdom of Wessex—which included the counties of Hants, Wilts, Berks, Dorset, and parts of the adjacent counties—was the result of a long series of aggressions by a single line of Saxon princes with their dependent under-kings. Lastly, Mercia, which ultimately occupied the middle of the island, was organized into one kingdom out of a considerable number of petty states, chiefly of the Anglian race, created by the later immigrations under insignificant chiefs—the petty gleaners of the great harvest which their predecessors had reaped with their swords.[1] The boundaries of these different

[1] Mr. Haddan gives the following dates of the Saxon conquest:—
A.D. 450—516. The district south of Thames, and the forest of Anderida, and westward from Kent (inclusive) to the Avon on the borders of Wilts and Dorset, becomes gradually Saxonized.
A.D. 516—577. The eastern side of Britain Saxonized.

conquests, starting from so many different centres, only gradually extended, and at last met and covered the land. Only when driven into the peninsulas of Cornwall and Wales were the hunted Britons able permanently to arrest the course of the invaders, and to maintain their independence in these last corners of the land.

When we try to discover what remnants of the British Church survived the Saxon conquest, we are met by the remarkable fact that the Church seems to have perished in the struggle, or to have retreated before the conquerors, so that when the conquest was completed there is no remnant of the British Church to be found, and hardly a trace of Christianity left throughout the conquered country. In this respect the history of England notably differs from that of the other provinces of the Roman Empire. The Teutonic hordes which founded kingdoms out of the dismembered provinces of the continent of Europe found there the civil institutions of the Empire and the organizations of the Church; and while the conquering race brought their rude energy and primitive virtues into an effete civilization, they themselves received from the conquered race its language, its civilization, and its Christianity. But from Britain the institutions of the Empire had been withdrawn; many of the better class of inhabitants had departed with the civil government and the legions; the force of the Church also may well have been weakened by these defections; and the Teutonic conquerors of England continued barbarous, illiterate,

A.D. 577—635. Wessex pushed on to the Severn. Mercia founded from Northumbria, but not extending over the centre of Britain till 626.

A.D. 635—681. The death of Cædwalla at the battle of Hefenfelt (635) closes the contest for Northumbria, and the battle of Winwæd, 656, for Mercia. But the Welsh claim to the sovereignty of Britain lingers on to the (supposed) death of Cadwallader.

and heathen. In the course of generations habits of peace, however, and growing prosperity, gradually tamed their manners and loosened their hold on their fierce and wild superstitions, and prepared them to receive Christianity and civilization when at length these came to them from without.

It is desirable to give a sketch, though ever so brief, of the religion of the race which, more than Briton, Roman, Dane, or Norman, is the ancestor of the Englishman and of the now widespread English-speaking race. It is not difficult to trace in the mythology of the Scandinavian races the remnants of an earlier and purer religion. This earlier religion taught, according to Tacitus, the being of "a supreme God, Master of the universe, to whom all things were submissive and obedient." The ancient Icelandic mythology calls Him "the Author of everything that existeth; the eternal, the ancient, the living and awful Being; the searcher into concealed things, the Being that never changeth." It attributes to Him an infinite power, a boundless knowledge, an incorruptible justice. His worshippers were forbidden to represent Him under any corporeal form, or to worship Him within the enclosure of walls. From this supreme God were sprung an infinite number of inferior deities or genii, which inhabited and ruled each part of the visible creation. The earth, water, fire, air, the sun, moon, and stars, the trees, forests, rivers, mountains, rocks, winds, thunder, tempests, had each their deity, and on that account were worthy of veneration. To serve the divinity with sacrifices and prayers, to be brave, to do no wrong to others, were the moral consequences they derived from their belief. Lastly, they believed in a future state of happiness or misery dependent upon their conduct here.

In later times the superstition of the people had added to the supreme God, Odin or Woden, twelve others whom they called the Æsir, with twelve goddesses, their wives. To these they built temples, in which they placed a representation of the divinity, and worshipped it with prayer and sacrifices. They still retained a belief in the immortality of the soul. The souls of the brave and good they believed went to Asgard, the abode of the Æsir; there the warriors fought all day, and spent the night in feasting in Valhalla, the hall of the gods; the wicked went to Niflheim, a place of pain and terror. But the time would come when the earth, and sun, and stars, and Valhalla, and the gods, and giants, and elves, should be consumed in a great and general conflagration, and then Gimli and Nastrond—the eternal heaven and hell—should be revealed. "A new earth, that is, Gimli, shall spring forth from the bosom of the waves, adorned with green meadows, where the fields bring forth without culture, and calamities are unknown, where there is a palace more shining than the sun, and there righteous and well-minded men shall abide." And far from thence is Nastrond, "a place full of serpents, who vomit forth floods of venom, in which shall wade evil men and women and murderers and adulterers."

There were three great festivals in the year—one at the winter solstice, called Jul or Yule, from which many social customs no doubt have descended to our Christian festival of the Nativity; the second at the first quarter of the second moon of the year; the third at the beginning of spring. Sacrifices of fruits, animals, and men were offered, and the people feasted and drank to excess. Their priests were not a separate caste; they professed to divine the future from the entrails of sacrifices.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

BEFORE we enter upon the history of the mission which Gregory the Great sent for the conversion of the English to the faith of Christ, it will be well to put the reader on his guard against the error of antedating the rise of the Papal system and the introduction of corruptions of doctrine into the mediæval Church. He must not be misled by the early existence of names and phrases which subsequently acquired a different significance. He must bear in mind that Romish corruptions grew gradually. Otherwise he will grievously misunderstand the history; he will do injustice to the ages which preserved for a thousand years the faith and discipline of the early Church, not without some incrustation of superstitions and some abuses, but without any authoritative inculcation of false doctrine and without any constitutional usurpations; he will fail to understand the comparatively modern date of the system of Church constitution and false doctrine which we call Popery. For example, the title Pope means nothing but Father, and at first was commonly given to all ecclesiastics, as it is to this day in the Eastern Church, where the clergy generally are called Popes. The title Papa—Pope—gradually passed into the languages of the various countries, as Padre, Père, and the like, which have exactly the same venerable and unobjectionable meaning as the word Pope accidentally retained by the Bishops of Rome.

So that there is a list of Roman "Popes" from the time of the Apostles downward; but what we call "The Papacy" belongs not to primitive but to mediæval Christianity.

So, again, a presence of our Lord in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper had been maintained in the Church from the beginning downwards, but that particular mode of it which we call transubstantiation was first heard of in the 9th century; and the practical deductions from it which so much shock us, followed afterwards one by one.

Phrases implying great veneration for the Blessed Virgin Mary may be found in Church writers from the 5th century, but the blasphemous system of which the modern Church of Rome has made her the centre, did not become part of the popular religion till the 13th century.

Confession was practised commonly in Saxon times as a useful discipline, but it was not taught that it was necessary for the forgiveness of sins committed after baptism until later times.

It will be useful to sketch the early constitution of the Church, and the gradual rise of the Papal pretensions, in order to enable the reader to see the true relations of the Church of England to other branches of the Church of Christ.

Wherever the Apostles by their preaching gathered together a number of converts, there they ordained a presbyter to continue the work which they had begun; as Paul and Barnabas on their mission in Asia Minor "ordained them elders in every Church." At first the Apostles retained in their own hands the government of the churches thus established; and we find in St. Paul's Epistles abundant evidence of the constant and detailed oversight which he exercised over them. After a while

they consecrated bishops to take the oversight of the congregations in a city or in some specified district. So St. James was appointed Bishop of Jerusalem and (probably) of the dependent congregations in the Holy Land; Timothy was appointed Bishop of Ephesus and its dependent country; Titus, Bishop of the churches of the island of Crete.

This constitution of the Church obtained universally in the first age. We will only quote in support of the assertion the well-known passage of Tertullian (c. 200 A.D.); he utters this challenge to some heretical congregations of his time:—"Let them show us the original of their churches, and give us a catalogue of their bishops in an exact succession from first to last, from which it shall appear that their first bishop had some Apostle, or some apostolical man living in the time of the Apostles, for his author or immediate predecessor. For thus it is that apostolical churches make their reckoning. The Church of Smyrna counts up to Polycarp, ordained by St. John; the Church of Rome to Clemens, ordained by St. Peter; and so all other churches in like manner exhibit their first bishops ordained by the Apostles, by whom the apostolical seed was propagated and conveyed to others." This implies that the Apostles settled bishops in the churches which they founded; and that this might be proved from the records and archives of every Church, most of which were then probably remaining.

As all the Apostles were equal, so in primitive times it was held that all bishops were equal as to their spiritual power and authority. The whole Church was one flock, and the whole world one diocese; and there was one episcopate in the Church, in which every bishop had his share. Still, for the sake of order, every bishop

presided over a particular diocese, and no bishop was ordinarily to interfere in the diocese of another.

Yet notwithstanding this equality a certain subordination of bishops naturally arose. In some cases this sprang originally out of the influence of a great name. For example, St. John in the latter part of his life presided over the Church of Antioch, and consecrated bishops in the country round about. During his life all those bishops would look up to St. John, and after his death it was natural that they should continue to pay a certain respect to his successor in his see, make him president over their meetings, and refer disputes to him as an umpire. In other cases a city was of such importance that it reflected a proportionate importance on the bishop who presided over its churches, and he naturally commanded a certain respect from his brethren of the neighbouring country. In all cases it was the custom of the churches to meet occasionally for the discussion and determination of questions of common interest, and convenience dictated that there should be a recognized territorial organization. The ecclesiastical divisions usually followed the civil divisions of the Empire and the national divisions of those countries which lay outside the Empire. The bishops of a particular province or country formed a group. Usually the bishop of the metropolitan city was the primate or metropolitan of the college of bishops, and they were called his suffragans; but sometimes, as in Africa, the senior bishop, wherever his see, was acknowledged as metropolitan. So now in the English Church, whoever is Archbishop of Canterbury is Primate of all England, but in the Scottish Church the bishops elect their Primus, who may be of any see. In the Canadian Church one of the Archbishops is Primate, and in the African

Church the Archbishop of Capetown; but in New Zealand, as in Scotland, the Primate is elected by the College of Bishops.

Gradually, for the sake of order, certain powers were exercised by these metropolitans, *e. g.* to summon councils of their suffragans, to publish the canons made by councils and see them observed, to decide controversies arising among their suffragans, and receive appeals from them. Still, as to their spiritual power and authority bishops were all equal. Each bishop was independent in his own see, and the Metropolitan was only *Primus inter pares*—first among equals.

Following the same law of organization in groups, and the same convenient acceptance of the organization of the civil government, we find these metropolitan provinces again grouped into patriarchates. Thus in after ages there were two provinces in England—the northern dioceses, grouped about the Archbishop of York as their metropolitan, formed one province, and the southern dioceses, grouped about Canterbury, formed another province; but it was obviously desirable to bring all the dioceses into a national unity, which was effected by making them a virtual patriarchate under the Archbishop of Canterbury.

These divisions of the Church underwent some changes to adapt them to the political changes of the world; and ultimately three principal Churches obtained a certain superiority over others. Rome from its political importance obtained a certain superiority in the West, Antioch in the East, and Alexandria in the South of Christendom. When the seat of Empire was subsequently moved to Constantinople that city was raised to a similar superiority; and Jerusalem was raised to the same rank by the Council of Chalcedon. But the centralization was

never carried any further. These patriarchates have throughout all ages remained, and still to this day remain, independent of one another. This is one of the strongholds of our argument against the Papal claim to be the head of the Universal Church. Rome has tyrannized over the churches of her own patriarchate, but the other patriarchates have never acknowledged or submitted to her claims over them. The patriarchates of Antioch and Alexandria have faded into insignificance, but they remain, together with that of Constantinople, recognized by the Orthodox East as the centre of its unity, the incontrovertible witnesses that Rome is not, and never has been, the Head of the whole Christian Church. Outside these patriarchates there were always certain metropolitans who had never been placed under the jurisdiction of any patriarch, and the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, decided that these outlying provinces of the Church should continue as they had done from the beginning. The Patriarch of Antioch at that time claimed to include one of them, Cyprus, under his patriarchate. But the Council decided that "the prelates of the Church of Cyprus should retain their rights uninjured and inviolate according to the canons of the sacred fathers and the ancient customs, and the same shall be observed in all other dioceses (= patriarchates) and provinces whatsoever, so that none of the bishops shall take another province which has not been formerly and from the beginning subject to him."

Since the organization of the Church had thus far followed that of the Empire, it was very natural that there should be an endeavour to carry the parallel one step further, and to give the Church a spiritual Emperor. The endeavour was made; and it is a fact full of interest that it was not made first by Rome. It was the Bishop

of Constantinople, after the seat of Empire had been transferred thither, who drew the deduction that the bishop of the capital of the Christian empire was marked out by providential circumstances as the head of the Christian Church. It is very interesting also to find the Bishop of Rome protesting against this assumption of superiority over the other patriarchs. John, the Bishop of "New Rome," in A.D. 589, had assumed in a public document the title of "Universal Bishop." It was a title which might be explained in a good sense; but it might be taken in a bad sense, and in this latter sense John probably had appropriated it. It was St. Gregory the Great who vehemently protested against the title, and the assumptions which it inferred. He writes on the subject to the Emperor: "I confidently affirm that whosoever calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is in his pride going before Antichrist, because, through pride, he prefers himself to the rest." To his brother Patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria he wrote: "This name 'Universal' was offered during the Holy Synod of Chalcedon to the Pontiff of the Apostolic See, a post which, by God's providence, I fill. But no one of my predecessors consented to use so profane a term, because plainly if a single patriarch is called 'universal,' the name of patriarch is taken from all the rest . . . . wherefore let your Holiness in your letters never call any one 'universal,' lest in offering undue honour to another you should deprive yourself of that which is your due." To John himself he wrote that "the sole Head of the Universal Church is Christ," and asks him "what account he will have to render to God at the last day if he thus tries to subject to himself as Universal Bishop the members of Christ, all of whom are equal." This, be it remembered, is the Gregory who sent

Augustine and his companions on their mission for the conversion of the English; so that we may be sure the Italian element in the English Church did not import with it the modern notion of the supremacy of the Pope.

It was the publication, towards the close of the 9th century, of the false Decretals, forged in the name of Isidore, which laid the foundation for the usurpation by the Bishops of Rome of this very authority which Gregory so forcibly argued against. These Decretals purported to be a collection of decrees of the early Bishops of Rome, and went to establish that the Popes of those early times did occupy the position of Head of the Church, and exercised an appellate jurisdiction over the whole Church. Still the power of the Popes made only gradual progress till the time of Gregory VII. in the 11th century. The English Church down to the Norman Conquest was not troubled with any serious pretensions of the See of Rome. It will be seen in a subsequent chapter that Wilfrid of York was the only bishop who carried an appeal to the Bishop of Rome against a decision of the English Church, and the way in which his appeal was treated is most worthy of note. The answer of the English Church was to call a Council, at which Wilfrid was condemned to imprisonment for making the appeal. And when Wilfrid returned a second time from Rome, bringing the decision of another Pope in his favour, Archbishop Theodore, the first Archbishop of the whole English Church, although he had been nominated and consecrated Archbishop by the Pope, utterly disregarded the Pope's sentence.

CHAPTER V

THE SAXON CONVERSION: THE ITALIAN MISSION

THE Saxons received their first Christian teachers from Rome. Bede tells us a picturesque story of the occasion of the mission, which, he says, he had received from the men of old. One morning as Gregory, the Archdeacon of the Church of Rome, was crossing the forum of the Eternal City, his attention was directed to the groups of slaves of various countries who were, as usual, exposed there for sale. One group of children especially attracted his notice by their fair complexions, blue eyes, and flaxen hair, so different from the sun-burnt skins and black hair of Italy, and he stopped to ask from what country they came. He was told they were Angles. "They would not only be Angles, but angels" (*non Angli sed angeli*), he replied, "if they were Christians. And from what province do they come?" He was told they came from Deira. "Truly, they should be called *de ira*" (from the wrath of God) "and brought to the mercy of Christ. And how is their king named?" "Ælla," was the reply. "Yea, may Alleluias be sung there!" And so the archdeacon went on his way.

But the incident made a strong impression on Gregory's mind, and he resolved to leave his high office at Rome, and go as a missionary to the people whose children had thus touched his heart. He actually set out upon his journey; but his friends and fellow-citizens, by whom he

was much beloved and highly valued, prevailed on the bishop to command him to return. Pope Benedict I. died, and Gregory was chosen in his place. He had never forgotten that group of fair English children, and, now that he had the power to befriend them, he took effectual steps to do so. He had himself founded a monastery on the Cælian Hill, and to that community he now turned for the agents of his mission to the Angles. He selected Augustine, the prior, and forty of the monks of his convent, and furnished them with necessaries, and letters of recommendation to the bishops and kings of France. The mission did not, however, go to Northumbria, the country from which Gregory's little friends of the Roman forum had come. Another place offered a more promising opening to the mission. The kingdom of Kent was the earliest settled of all the Saxon kingdoms. In the time of the Empire it had probably been one of the most completely civilized parts of the province; its conquest by the Jutes had probably been effected with less social disturbance and less destruction of property than had taken place elsewhere. The Kentish men had thus originally acquired a tincture of civilization from the conquered people, which was maintained by their intercourse with the opposite coasts of Gaul; and probably at this time Kent was the most civilized and most prosperous of the Heptarchic kingdoms. The undefined authority represented by the title of Bretwalda was held by Ethelbert, its present king. He had allied himself in marriage to the Frank kings, his wife Bertha being a daughter of Charibert, King of Paris. At her marriage it had been stipulated that she should enjoy freedom to follow her religion, and a Frank bishop named Liudhard formed part of her household. The king repaired for their use a ruined church of the old Britons, which stood

outside the walls of the royal town of Canterbury.[1] Ethelbert, therefore, already knew something of Christianity, had tolerated it, and might be brought by his wife's influence to embrace it. It is even said that application had already been made on the part of the Kentish men to the Frank bishops to send them missionaries.[2] Kent, therefore, clearly offered the most likely opening for a mission, and thither the mission was directed to proceed.

Augustine and his forty companions landed in the Isle of Thanet in 596 or 597 A.D., and sent to announce their arrival to the king. Some days afterwards the king came to them, and gave them audience under an ancient oak in the open air, a precaution against their exercising any influence over him by magical arts, which were supposed to be more easily practised within a building. But they came furnished not with magical but with Divine power; they approached him in orderly procession, preceded by a silver cross, and for their banner a picture of our Lord painted on a panel, and singing a Litany. At the king's command they sat down and preached to him and his attendants. The king did all that could be expected. He gave them leave to remain in his kingdom, and permitted them to preach and make converts. With his permission they proceeded at once to Canterbury; and we can picture to ourselves the crowds of fair-haired, blue-eyed Saxon men and women and children lining the rude streets of the royal town to see these forty Italians, in their long dark robes, entering the town in procession, with the silver cross glancing in the sunlight, and the painted banner of our Lord borne aloft, chanting their

[1] The church—that of St. Martin—was rebuilt in the 13th century; there is a good deal of Roman brick built up in its walls, the material, no doubt, of the original Romano-British Church.

[2] Kemble's 'Saxons in England,' II. p. 356.

Litany in an unknown language. As they entered the city, Bede tells us, they added the prayer, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, in all Thy mercy, that Thy anger and wrath be turned away from this city, and from Thy holy house, because we have sinned. Hallelujah."

Not till a year after the arrival of the missionaries did Ethelbert become a convert to their teaching; and when the king was baptized the people followed his example in considerable numbers. At Christmas 597 A.D., Augustine is said to have baptized 10,000 converts in the river Irwell. Before long the king gave the Italians an old British church in Canterbury, and a settled residence in the city, and such possessions of different kinds as were necessary to their subsistence.

The course of conversion of the other kingdoms followed the precedent of Kent with curious uniformity. In the case of Northumbria, Mercia, and Sussex, a princess of a Christian royal house was married to a heathen king, with the condition that she should retain her religion, and should be allowed a chaplain. The chaplain addressed himself first to the conversion of the king. In Northumbria, the king, when he had made up his mind to adopt Christianity, laid it before his Witan as a matter of national concern. The Witan came to a resolution to change the national religion; and then the people generally submitted to teaching and baptism. We conclude that, with growing civilization, their old heathenism had lost its hold on the national mind, and that it had become, as their religion had to the Romans of the later Republic and the Empire, a piece of State machinery; and thus the people were willing to change it at the desire of their king and chiefs.

Gregory had directed Augustine, if he were successful in his mission, to seek consecration as Archbishop of

the English nation at the hands of the Gallic bishops. As soon, therefore, as Augustine had met with this great success in Kent he went to the continent, where the Bishop of Arles and other French bishops, pursuant to Gregory's request, consecrated him Bishop of the English.

For many years little progress was made beyond the kingdom of Kent. Redwald, the King of East Anglia (Norfolk and Suffolk), was induced by Ethelbert to be baptized and to take one of Augustine's companions to preach the Gospel in his kingdom. The new faith was, however, opposed by his queen and other influential people; he himself cannot have been a very sincere convert, since, while he worshipped at a Christian altar, he allowed the queen to retain her heathen worship at another altar in the same building. It is not to be wondered at that in these circumstances the Gospel made no progress in East Anglia.

The missionaries had better success in the kingdom of Essex, which from 616 to 623 A.D. was under the rule of Sebert, the nephew of Ethelbert. To him Mellitus was sent, and he succeeded in converting the king and many of his subjects, and was consecrated Bishop of the East Saxons, establishing his see in London.

In 625 A.D., twenty-eight years after the landing of Augustine, Ethelbert being dead, and Eadbald his son reigning in Kent, Edwin, King of Northumbria, sought Ethelburga, the daughter of Ethelbert and sister of Eadbald, in marriage. The alliance was agreed to on the same conditions on which her mother had married Ethelbert, viz., that she should have freedom to practise her religion, and should have a Christian priest with her as chaplain. Paulinus was the one chosen. King Edwin readily heard Paulinus's teaching, but hesitated to

embrace the new faith. He allowed his child and other converts to be baptized, he gave up the worship of idols, he held frequent conversations with the bishop about the faith, and with his chiefs about the step which he was urged to take. At length, after about a year's hesitation, he assembled the Witan, and laid the matter before the assembly.

Bede gives a report of what took place, which is very interesting for the light it throws on the state of mind in which the preaching of the Gospel found our heathen forefathers. The king asked those assembled one by one what they thought of the new doctrine and the new worship that was preached. The chief of the heathen priests, Coifi by name, was the first to answer: "I declare to you that the religion we have hitherto professed has, so far as I know, no virtue in it; for none of your people have worshipped the gods more diligently than I, and yet there are many who receive greater favours from you, and are more prosperous in all their undertakings. Now, if the gods were good for anything, they would rather prosper me, who have been more careful to serve them. If, therefore, upon examination, you find these new doctrines more efficacious, let us at once receive them." This speech gives us the view of one class of men, who look upon religion as a system by which temporal prosperity is to be obtained as the reward for the diligent performance of the outward observances of a superstitious worship. Another speech of one of the thanes shows us that there were some minds prepared to welcome a religion which could throw light on the mystery of human life. "The present life of man, O king, seems to me, in comparison of that time which is unknown to us, like the swift flight of a sparrow through the hall wherein you sit at supper in winter with your commanders and

ministers. There is a good fire in the midst, whilst the storms of rain and snow prevail abroad. The sparrow flies in at one door and immediately out at another. While he is within he is safe from the wintry storm, but, after a short space of fair weather, he immediately vanishes out of your sight again into the dark winter from which he came. So this life of man appears here for a short space, but of what went before or what is to follow we are utterly ignorant. If, therefore, this new teaching contains some more certain information, it deserves to be followed." Paulinus was therefore invited to address the assembly. Bede describes the missionary's personal appearance from the recollections of one who as a boy had seen him, and enables us to present before our minds the tall, thin, rather stooping figure of the Italian, with dark hair and aquiline features, in his dark flowing robes, standing in the midst, while the king and the thanes and the freemen sit round the rude timber hall, in their snowy tunics and cloaks fastened at the shoulder by a great circular brooch. Bede has not recorded his sermon, but he tells us the results it produced. When he had finished, Coifi the high priest spoke again, and even his mind had been attuned to a higher strain of thought by what he had heard: "I have long since been sensible that there was nothing in that which we worshipped, because the more diligently I sought after truth in that worship the less I found it. But now I freely confess that such truth evidently appears in this preaching as can confer on us the gifts of life, of salvation, and of eternal happiness; for which reason I advise, O king, that we instantly abjure and set fire to those temples and altars which we have consecrated without reaping any benefit from them."

In fine, the king publicly declared that he embraced

the religion of Christ. The high priest volunteered to set the example of overthrowing the old heathenism by a public act. Borrowing of the king a horse and arms, which it was unlawful for him to wear, he rode forth to the neighbouring temple at Goodmanham, in Yorkshire, cast his spear into it, and bade those who accompanied him set fire to it. "King Edwin, with all the nobility of the nation, and a large number of the common people, received the faith and the washing of regeneration in the year 627." While they were being instructed a wooden oratory was built over a spring, in which the king was baptized, and then at once he commenced a larger and nobler church of stone round about the oratory. The church of stone has grown into the glorious pile of York Minster; and the well in which Edwin was baptized still remains in the crypt. His subjects followed the example of their king as readily as the men of Kent had done, and Paulinus too is said to have baptized his 10,000 in a day. Thus, in a little more than a quarter of a century, the Italian missionaries sent over by Gregory had introduced the Christian Church into four out of the seven Saxon kingdoms.

But it is remarkable that in all but one of these places, when the sovereign died under whose influence the faith had been introduced, the nation at once relapsed into its old idolatry. In Essex, when Sebert died, his sons, who succeeded to his kingdom, returned to their old religion; Bishop Mellitus fled to Canterbury, and the East Saxon converts relapsed. In East Anglia the faith did not flourish under the lukewarm patronage of Redwald; we do not hear of the consecration of a bishop for this kingdom; and his son and successor was a heathen, under whom no fresh attempt to establish the Church was made. When Edwin, King of Northumbria,

was slain in battle in 634 A.D., Paulinus retired into Kent with the widowed queen and her children, and the Church seems to have collapsed in Northumbria. In Kent alone the Church held its ground; and even there it was very near suffering the same fate as in the other kingdoms; for on the death of Ethelbert, his son Eadbald relapsed into heathen customs and married his father's widow; Justus, Bishop of Rochester, and Mellitus of London were expelled by their people, and crossed over to Gaul; Laurentius, who had succeeded Augustine in his see, was about to follow their example, when Eadbald was restored to the faith, and the Church of Kent was saved.

Just at this time, viz., in 635 A.D., another Italian missionary named Birinus, who was sent on an independent mission at his own request by Honorius, Bishop of Rome, landed in the kingdom of Wessex (which included Surrey, Hants, Wilts, Berks, Dorset, Somerset, and Devon), and being successful in his labours both with the king and the people, established his see at Dorchester, in Oxfordshire. This is the extent of the share which the Italians had in the conversion of England. The recovery of the relapsed Northumbrians and East Saxons, the establishment of the Church in East Anglia, and the conversion of Mercia and Sussex, are due to other agencies, to which we must next direct attention.

CHAPTER VI

THE FOUNDING OF IONA

HALF England was evangelized by the monks of Lindisfarne; their influence is still, after a thousand years have elapsed, to be traced in our English Christianity. The House of Lindisfarne was a colony from Iona; Iona was founded by St. Columba, who came from Ireland; Ireland was converted by St. Patrick; and St. Patrick, whether or not a native of Northern Britain, received his training and holy orders, not from Rome, but from the Gallic Church. It is so important to our purpose that the magnitude of the part this Celtic element has had in the formation of our English Church should be realized, and its ecclesiastical character understood, that before we speak about the work of the Celtic missionaries among the Angles and Saxons, we shall look back and study the community of Iona; and, that we may thoroughly appreciate the character of Iona, we shall look back still further to the great Apostle of Ireland from whom they derived their Christian doctrine and their ecclesiastical customs.

The birth name of Patrick was Succath. He was born of Christian parentage, his father, Calphurnius, being a deacon, and his grandfather, Potitus, a priest.[1] Calphurnius is said also to have held the rank of a Decurion, equivalent to that of an alderman of a corporate town,

[1] Examples of a married clergy in the Church of the 4th century.

and was therefore probably one who had adopted the Roman civilization. Patrick was probably born about 387 A.D., and probably at a place now called Kirkpatrick, between Dumbarton and Glasgow.

As the eastern coasts of England were exposed to the incursions of the Northmen, so the western coasts were harried by the Irish. When Patrick was sixteen years old, a band of these Irish marauders ravaged the country, and carried off himself and two sisters, among hundreds of others, into captivity. For seven years Patrick was a slave in that part of the Irish kingdom of Dalraida which is now the county Antrim. At the end of that time he escaped home, was again taken, and after a short time made good his escape. He now felt within himself a call to preach the Gospel to these people among whom he had been a slave, and set out to the monasteries of Southern Gaul to prepare himself for this work. It seems certain that he went to the monastery of St. Martin at Tours, and submitted for some time to the strict discipline of that famous school of learning and devotion. Afterwards it is probable he studied with Germanus at Auxerre, and then visited for a time the famous school at Lerins, in the Tuscan Sea, where Hilary of Arles and Lupus of Troyes had been educated. He was in all probability ordained deacon and priest in Gaul. When he was now forty-two years old, in the year 432 A.D., Palladius, who had been sent by Pope Celestine to take charge of some congregations of Christians which had been gathered together in Ireland, and to carry on missionary work there, retired to England, reporting the failure of his mission. Thereupon Patrick saw the way open to him. It is claimed on behalf of Rome that Patrick was consecrated bishop by Celestine, but the claim seems quite untenable; and it is all but certain that he sought consecration where he

had received his training and holy orders, at the hands of the bishops of Gaul. In the year 432 A.D., he sailed with twelve companions to the work for which he had during twenty years been preparing himself. We need not recount how successfully he laboured. We need only notice that his method of establishing the Church among the wild people was that which he had seen in the monastery of St. Martin, the Abbot-Bishop of Tours, and in the other great religious schools of Gaul: he planted monasteries under abbot-bishops — Christian colonies — as centres of education, civilization, and evangelization. St. Patrick died probably about the year 465 A.D.

Some years after the death of St. Patrick, Ireland seems to have been indebted to the Church of Wales for a revival of learning and religion. The Irish saints of the second order are represented in their legendary lives as going to Britain, and especially to St. David, for their religious training. For example, St. Finian of Clonard is said to have been thus indebted to the great Welsh saint. This St. Finian of Clonard was the abbot-bishop of one of the great Irish monastic schools of learning. Bede says that his monastery and that of St. Comgall of (the Irish) Bangor each numbered as many as 3000 inmates.

Fifty-six years after the death of the Apostle of Ireland, Columba was born, of a princely family ruling a tribe among the wildest of the Donegal mountains. Sent early to the monastic school of the St. Finian of Clonard above mentioned, he obtained some celebrity for learning and religious zeal. In due time he was ordained deacon and priest, and himself founded one or more monasteries. We have seen that it was usual for the heads of these Irish monasteries to be bishops as well as abbots. The

legend says that Columba went to a famous anchorite bishop to be consecrated.[1] The bishop by some misunderstanding ordained him over again to the priesthood. Columba accepted this as a providential interposition, and would never allow himself to be consecrated to the episcopate. There is always a tendency in the followers of a great man to imitate his peculiarities, and it became a custom of the rulers of abbeys of the Columban succession to remain priests. In the year 563 A.D., being now forty-two years old, he undertook a mission to Scotland. There are different accounts of the occasion of this mission. One account attributes it solely to his zeal for the spread of the Gospel. Another account gives us a curious picture of the times. It tells us that Columba, on a visit to his old master, Finian, took opportunities to make a surreptitious copy of "Finian's Psalter"; that Finian, aware of what was being done, waited till the copy was finished, and then laid claim to it; that the dispute was referred to the king, Diarmid, who gave judgment in the proverbial sentence, "To every cow belongeth her calf," and so to every book its copy, and decided against Columba. At the same time the son of a king of Connaught, who was living at the court of Diarmid as a hostage, in a quarrel with the son of one of the nobles, accidentally killed him, and fled for sanctuary to Columba; but the privilege which attached to sacred persons and places was not allowed, apparently on the ground that the similar privilege of the royal court had been violated by the homicide being committed

[1] One of the peculiarities of the British Church was, that consecration was performed by a single bishop, instead of by three according to the canon of the Council of Nice. Such a consecration would be valid though irregular. This irregularity, we shall see, was one of the points which Theodore had to deal with when he came to settle the constitution of the Church of England.

within it. Columba went away in anger; at his instigation his kinsmen joined the King of Connaught and marched against Diarmid, and a battle ensued. A synod subsequently determined that Columba, as the author of the slaughter, ought to quit his country and win from the heathen as many souls to Christ as had perished in the battle. Accordingly, having selected twelve companions, he sailed for the western coast of Scotland. If the reader will look at the map he will be better able to follow the next paragraph. About sixty years before a chieftain of the house of Eirc, head of the Irish Dalraida, had crossed over with a considerable body of followers to the coast of Argyleshire, and founded the kingdom of British Dalraida or Scotia.[1] These were Christians, and Columba was allied to them by blood. The Picts to the south of the Grampians, between these mountains and the Frith of Forth, had received Christianity through the preaching of Ninian, a bishop of North Wales, who taught among them from 412 to 432 A.D., establishing the see of Candida Casa (Whithern). Columba directed his mission to the Picts who inhabited the country between these two Christian kingdoms, *i.e.* the country south of Dalraida and north of the Grampians.

If the reader will look at the map before him, he will see a little island then called Hii, afterwards Latinized into Iona. Here Columba and his twelve companions landed. It will be seen that it is on the confines of two of the kingdoms above mentioned—of the kingdom of Dalraida and of the Pictish kingdom to the south of it—and it was claimed by both kings. Columba obtained

[1] Let it be borne in mind that the name Scot belonged in the first instance to the inhabitants of Ireland; was carried by Irish conquerors into northern Britain; and was by degrees appropriated by the Caledonian Picts; the gradual advance of the name marking the footsteps of the Irish missionaries.

from both the cession of their claims, and proceeded to establish himself upon it. We gather from his historian, Adamnan, that his monastery consisted of a church built of timber, and a few rude buildings, constructed, in the usual Celtic manner, of wattle, *i. e.* of osiers interwoven between posts. There was a dwelling for the abbot and his monks, another for the entertainment of strangers, an eating-room, and a kitchen, all arranged round a green court; this group of cloister-buildings was enclosed by a rampart, and outside this was a byre for cows, a barn and storehouse for grain, and other outbuildings. The rule of the house enjoined obedience, humility, and chastity. The occupations of the day were devotion, reading and writing, and manual labour. The devotions consisted of daily morning and evening prayer. The brethren were skilful writers and illuminators of books, for the Irish ecclesiastics had formed a famous school of calligraphy. Some of the books written by Columba himself still remain—the "Book of Kells" and the "Book of Durrow"—and are very fine examples of the clear, bold, handsome writing and wonderfully elaborate ornamentation of this Irish school. For manual labour they ploughed, sowed, reaped, milked the cows, made cheese, fished. Columba himself was a remarkable man: of princely birth, tall, athletic, powerful, of a ruddy and joyous countenance; he was an eminent teacher in all the learning of his time, a guide of deep spiritual devotion; and with these attainments of a scholar and an ascetic, he combined the qualities of a practical man; he superintended the farm, ground the corn in the quern, steered the coracle over the stormy seas. Iona was his head-quarters for thirty-four years. He still retained the superintendence of the establishments which he had founded in Ireland, and visited them from time to time.

On the other side he made missionary tours through Scotland. Aided by his disciples, he preached the Word, gathered converts, caused them to erect osier churches; left one or two of his scholars to carry on the work; and so passed on from place to place, till he had penetrated Scotland from sea to sea. Embarking in their frail coracles—boats formed of hide stretched over a framework of osiers—he braved the northern seas and carried the Gospel to the distant Hebrides and Orkneys—the "Polynesia" of the missions of that day. He died at Iona in the year 597 A.D. His monastery became famous, and the mother of other monasteries. His disciples had a great share in converting the English and the Germans, and in quickening the spiritual life of Northern France, reproducing the monastery of Hii at Lindisfarne, at St. Gall, at Luxeuil, and Bobbio, and elsewhere.

We shall see in the next chapter that as Rome was the source of the Italian mission, and Kent was the scene of its operations, so Iona was the source of the Celtic mission, and Lindisfarne the English centre of its activity.

CHAPTER VII

THE CELTIC MISSION

We have seen in a former chapter how Christianity was introduced into Northumbria by Paulinus, under Edwin the king.

In 633 A.D., the fierce Penda, King of Mercia, entered into a confederation with Cædwalla, King of the Britons, and defeated this Edwin of Northumbria in a great battle at Heathfield; the British prince made himself master of the whole of Northumbria and ruled cruelly for one year. Then the heir of the Bernician branch of the royal house of the Northumbrian Angles, which had been dispossessed by Edwin, the representative of the rival Deiran branch, assayed to recover the kingdom. Returning with a small band of his companions in exile, some of his countrymen rallied round his banner. Cædwalla marched against him, and Oswald awaited the assault in a favourable position at Hefenfelt near Hexham. Before engaging the numerous forces of Cædwalla, Oswald caused a wooden cross to be fixed in the ground, before which he and his little army knelt and prayed for the Divine help on their just cause. Bede mentions that there was no sign of the Christian faith, no church, no altar erected throughout all the nation of the Bernicians until Oswald set up this cross, before giving battle to his barbarous enemy. This was one of the decisive battles of the Anglo-Saxon conquest, for in it the British king suffered a total defeat, and the Angles gained permanent

possession of Northumbria. Oswald united in himself again the sovereignty over the two Northumbrian kingdoms of Deira and Bernicia.

During the seventeen years' exile of his family, Oswald had received instruction from the Scottish missionaries; and that he was in earnest in his Christianity seems proved by his whole life, from his prayer before the battle of Hefenfelt onwards. As soon as he was established on the throne he took steps to recover his people to the faith. He did not send to recall Paulinus to his abandoned work. Paulinus had been the bishop of Edwin, the enemy of his house, and had fled with Edwin's widow and children to Kent, and was now ruling in the see of Rochester. Nor did he commission Jacob the deacon, whom Paulinus had left behind him, to send to Canterbury for some other of the Italian missionaries. He naturally turned to the Scottish priests, by whom he had himself been instructed, and sent messengers inviting Segenius, the Abbot of Hii—the fourth abbot from Columba—to undertake the work of re-establishing the faith among his people. The abbot first sent one of his monks named Corman, a man of austere disposition, who met with little success, and after a while returned to Hii, admitting the failure of his mission. In an assembly of the brethren he reported that he had not been able to do any good to the nation he had been sent to preach to, because they were uncivilized men and of a stubborn and barbarous disposition. The assembly debated what was to be done, for they desired that the nation should receive the salvation they had asked, and were grieved that they had not more favourably received the preacher sent them. While they considered it, one of the brethren said, "I am of opinion, brother, that you were more severe to your unlearned hearers than you ought to have been, and

did not, as the Apostle bids, first give them the milk of more easy doctrine, till, being by degrees nourished with the Word of God, they should be capable of greater perfection." The brethren approved what this speaker, Aidan, had said, and came to the conclusion that they could not do better than send him to their friend King Oswald.

Off the coast of Northumbria the reader will find in the map a little island, connected at low tide with the mainland, called Lindisfarne, or Holy Island; Aidan begged this from King Oswald that he might make it a second Iona, and there he commenced the mission which gradually extended its labours over Northumbria and Mercia and the kingdom of the East Saxons.

Aidan is a man to be placed side by side with Augustine in the estimation of Englishmen, for they were the co-apostles of the English Church. Bede has left us a charming portrait of his character: "He was a man of singular meekness, piety, and zeal." "It was the greatest commendation of his doctrine with all men, that he taught no otherwise than he and his followers lived. He neither sought nor loved anything of this world, but delighted in distributing immediately among the poor whatsoever was given him by the kings or rich men of the world. He used to travel both town and country on foot, and he would address all whom he met, rich or poor—if not Christians, inviting them to embrace the faith; if believers, confirming them in the faith and stirring them up to almsgiving and good works. All who accompanied him, whether monks or laymen, were employed in reading the Scriptures or learning the Psalms." In another place, Bede says: "He was beloved and venerated by all, even by the Bishops of the Italian school, Honorius of Canterbury, and Felix of the East Angles." The king,

Oswald, zealously seconded his bishop's efforts. He himself, while Aidan was imperfectly acquainted with the English tongue, would interpret his discourses to his companions, as King Kamehameha IV. of Hawaii did in our days for his bishop. He followed the bishop's virtues too, was humble and affable, and generous to the poor. Under such hands the work prospered. Many of the Scots came into the kingdom to help in it. The Holy Island became a flourishing monastery: churches were built here and there over the kingdom; the people flocked joyfully together to hear the Word, and were instructed in Christianity and civilization; money and lands were given of the bounty of the king and his thanes to build and endow churches.

Here is an anecdote of Aidan's generosity. Oswin (of the family of Edwin, who on Oswald's death ruled for seven years over Deira) had given him an extraordinarily fine horse which he might use in crossing rivers or in any journey that needed haste, for, as we have said, he usually journeyed on foot. Soon after a poor man meeting him and asking alms, he at once dismounted, and bade the horse with all its royal furniture be given to the beggar, "for he was very compassionate to the poor, and as it were the father of the wretched." When the king heard of it he was, not unnaturally, a little provoked; and as they went in to dinner he remonstrated with him, "Why did you give that horse which I had particularly chosen for yourself? had not we other horses which would have done as well to give away to a beggar?" To whom the bishop replied, "What is it you say, O king! is that foal of a mare more dear to you than a child of God?" Upon this they went in to dinner. The bishop sat down in his place; but the king, who was come in from hunting, stood warming himself at the fire. Suddenly calling to mind

what the bishop had said, he ungirt his sword and gave it to a servant, and fell down at the bishop's feet, and asked his forgiveness. "From this time forward I will not judge of what, or how much of our money, you shall give to the children of God." The bishop was much moved at the sight, and starting up, raised the king, saying "he was entirely reconciled to him if he would sit down to his meal and lay aside all sorrow."

The good bishop died in the seventeenth year of his episcopacy, and the story of his death throws still further light on the labours of his life. He was at the king's country house not far from Bamborough, "for having a church and a chamber there he was wont often to go and stay there, and to make excursions to preach in the country round about; which he likewise did at other of the king's country seats, having nothing of his own besides his church and a few fields about it. When he was sick they set up a tent for him close to the wall at the west end of the church; therein he gave up the ghost, leaning against a timber buttress which supported the church wall." It is right that the memory of the founder of the mission to which half England owes its Christianity should be kept alive among us; and the particulars of his story admirably illustrate the life of a missionary bishop of those days, and the way in which England was evangelized.

Oswy succeeded his brother Oswald in Bernicia, and after seven years, by the slaughter of Oswin, re-united the two Northumbrian kingdoms in 642 A.D. Some years after, Peada, the son of Penda, King of Mercia, sought the daughter of Oswy in marriage. Oswy would not consent unless Peada would become a Christian. This he did, and returned to Mercia with four Lindisfarne priests; and though old King Penda did not embrace

the new religion, he allowed it to be preached under his son's patronage; and Diuma, one of the four priests, was consecrated Bishop of Mercia.

In 653 Sigebert succeeded to the throne of Essex. He was on terms of great friendship with Oswy, and, visiting him after his accession to the throne, he was converted by Finan, the successor of Aidan, and returned to his kingdom, taking back with him two of the Lindisfarne priests, who succeeded in establishing the faith among his subjects, and one of them, Cedd, the brother of Chad of Lichfield, was consecrated bishop.

Sigebert, who succeeded to the kingdom of East Anglia in 636 A.D., had spent some years in banishment in France, where he was baptized; and, when he returned to take possession of his kingdom, Felix, a Burgundian bishop, came to him and undertook the conversion of his people. Felix was very successful in his work, and was assisted in it by Fursey, a priest who came over from Ireland.

Only the kingdom of the South Saxons remains to be accounted for, the latest of the kingdoms to receive the faith of Christ. It owed its conversion to the able, restless, turbulent Wilfrid of York; who, when he was banished from the Northumbrian kingdom for his offence in appealing to Rome, was driven by a storm upon the coast of Sussex, where he found the people still heathens. Here again the king had married a Christian princess, and some Christian monks had settled down in their neighbourhood; but they had not succeeded in winning any of the people. Wilfrid commenced the task with characteristic energy, and gained many converts, establishing a monastery at Selsey. Wilfrid was a Northumbrian by birth, though an ardent partisan of the Roman school.

Thus we find that Italian missionaries Christianized

Kent and Wessex; the Celtic missionaries Christianized Mercia; and a Northumbrian, with a Roman education, introduced Christianity into Sussex. The work was begun by the Italians and finished by the Scots in Northumbria and Essex. So about equal credit is due to Rome and to Iona; for if Rome may claim the special merit of having been the first to send the Gospel to the heathen Anglo-Saxons, Iona may perhaps fairly balance that claim by the fact that when the work was finished, the evangelization of by far the larger portion of England[1] was found to be due to her children. Nor must we overlook the aid which we received from the Frankish Church, first in the influence of the French princess Bertha and her bishop in preparing the way for the conversion of Kent; in the consecration of Augustine, and lastly, in the founding of the East Anglian Church by Felix the Burgundian.

The reader will have noticed that the ancient British Church took no part in this conversion of their conquerors, and a few words ought to be said on the subject.

King Ethelbert, at Augustine's request, arranged a conference between Augustine and some of his companions on one side, and some bishops of the British Church on the other, which took place under an oak, still, in Bede's time, called Augustine's oak, probably at Aust on the Severn, in Gloucestershire. His object was to invite them first to conform to the Roman customs in the time of keeping Easter and other points, and, secondly, to co-operate with him in evangelizing the Saxons. When the arguments of the Italians failed to induce the Britons to consent to forsake the ancient customs of their Church, Augustine is said by Bede to have supported his views by miraculously giving sight

[1] In territory, not in then existing population.

to a blind man. The Britons, though influenced by this, declared that they could not depart from their ancient customs without the consent of their people, and asked for a second meeting at which more of their number might be present. On the second occasion seven bishops[1] were present, and many learned men, especially of the monastery of Bangor Iscoed. On their way to the conference they consulted a hermit, who had a great reputation for wisdom and sanctity, whether they ought to agree to Augustine's proposals. He gave them the oracular answer, "If he is a man of God, follow him." "But how shall we know that?" said they. He replied, "Our Lord hath said, 'Take My yoke upon you and learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly in heart'; if, therefore, Augustine is meek and lowly of heart, it is to be believed that he has taken upon him the yoke of Christ, and offers the same to you to take upon you. But if he is stern and haughty, it will appear that he is not of God, and we are not to regard his words." They still asked further, "How shall we discern this?" "Take care," he said, "to arrive last at the place; if, at your approach, he shall rise to receive you, hear him, for he is a servant of Christ; if he treats you haughtily and does not rise to you, then let him be despised by you." Unhappily Augustine stood upon the dignity of archbishop, which he claimed, and did not do the British representatives the courtesy to rise to receive them; and thus the result of the synod was determined before a word was spoken. Augustine had reduced his proposals to three heads: if they would keep Easter at the due time, and baptize according to the Roman custom, and

[1] This is a large number of bishops for the Church of Wales. It may be that there were among them bishops of Cumbria and of the peninsula of Cornwall and Devon, which were still unconquered.

unite with him in preaching the Gospel to the English, he would readily tolerate all their other deviations from the Italian usages. The proposals were reasonable enough, and would have been accepted; but, as in all the subsequent rivalry of the native and the Italian Churches, there was another question in the background. Bede shows us what it was which really influenced the British ecclesiastics when he says, "They answered, 'They would do none of those things, *nor receive him as their archbishop;*' for, they said among themselves, if he would not now rise up to us, how much more will he contemn us as of no worth if we shall put ourselves under his subjection." This clearly was the meaning of the test which the old hermit gave them, whether if they accepted him as archbishop he would be a brother in Christ—*primus inter pares*—or whether he would make himself a lord over them. The interview ended with some words of Augustine to the effect that if they would not preach the Gospel to the Saxons as brethren, it would not be surprising if they were slain by them as enemies—a very natural reflection, which was afterwards looked upon as a prophecy, fulfilled when 1200 of the monks of Bangor were massacred by the Northumbrians at the battle of Carlegion.

It is idle to speculate what different results might have followed if Augustine had been more courteous. As it was, the British Church withdrew into itself and took no part in the conversion of the Saxons. This was made an occasion of reproach against them down to the time of Bede, who complains, that "to this day it is the custom of the Britons not to pay any respect to the faith and religion of the English, nor to correspond with them any more than with pagans." We must do them the justice to remember that when the Italian missionaries landed

in the long-settled kingdom of Kent, the Saxon conquest was not even yet complete in the west and north, and for many a year after, it remained uncertain whether the British might not recover some of their lost ground, or whether, on the other hand, the tide of invasion might not send forth one last wave which would sweep the British race entirely out of the corners into which it had been driven. This must have kept up a constant feeling of hostility between the Saxon and the British races, and may well explain why the British Churches for so long a time took no part in the Saxon conversion. While the conquered race was yet in arms against further aggression, they were little likely to be organizing peaceful missions to convert the fierce aggressor; and while the conquering race was still filled with warlike and aggressive designs, it was little likely to receive the teaching of the people whom they must have despised because they had conquered them, and hated because they had injured them.

The British Church was not wholly negligent of the duty of spreading the Gospel. We have already mentioned the mission of Ninian to the Picts in 412; and the fact that about 544—565, missionaries of the British Church, under the auspices of St. David, St. Gildas, and St. Cadoc, restored or revived the faith in Ireland. Thus indirectly the British Church had some influence in the conversion of the Saxons.

The place which the British Church refused to take in the Saxon conversion was, we have seen, taken by a kindred Church, which brought precisely the same ecclesiastical elements to the moulding of the character of the Church of England; and the unity which Augustine failed to give to the English Church was afterwards accomplished by Theodore, but with probably the impress

of a more independent national spirit, and a less tendency to lean upon Rome.

These details, however briefly given, may have been found a little uninteresting, but they were very necessary to establish the fact that Rome has no claim to the obedience of the Church of England on the ground that she gave us our Christianity. God forbid that we should be ungrateful to the good Bishop Gregory, or to Augustine and Paulinus and Mellitus and Justus and Laurentius, and the rest of their fellow-labourers, for the share they took in the work; neither may we be ungrateful to the holy fathers of Iona and Lindisfarne, to Aidan and Finan, and Chad and Cedd, for labours which were equally self-denying, and which left wider and more lasting results.

CHAPTER VIII

THE HEPTARCHIC CHURCHES

So far the work of the Church among the Saxons was a missionary work. There was no "Church of England" yet. Indeed, there was no "England" yet, but a number of separate and independent Jute and Anglian and Saxon kingdoms, perpetually at war with one another.

Each kingdom had a separate and independent mission at work in it. The way in which these missions were organized and carried on was alike in all the kingdoms. The missionary bishops, both Italians and Celts, had been brought up in religious communities; it was natural that they should adopt a similar organization, and probably it was the organization best suited to the circumstances.

Each bishop established himself in some convenient central place, where he lived, together with his clergy. His first care, of course, was to set up the Divine worship. His second was to provide for the education of the youth of the kingdom, and the training of a body of native clergy. The early missionaries were all learned men, and they came among a rude, unlettered people; and, in addition to the gift of the Christian faith, they conferred on them the gifts of learning and civilization also. But while some of the clergy were employed in devotion, study, and education at head-quarters, others were sent out to itinerate among the towns and scattered hamlets in the forest clearings, first to convert the people and form them into churches, and then to re-visit them from time to time, to

teach, to celebrate Divine worship, and to administer the sacraments.

The bishop himself was the busiest of all. Part of his time was spent at his cathedral, superintending its manifold work; himself the chief adviser of the king and his council, the chief teacher of the schools, the diligent preacher in the cathedral on Sundays and holidays, the overseer of the work of his itinerating priests. At other times he himself made long and laborious visitations through the whole kingdom, visiting the congregations which had been formed, confirming the children, preaching to the people, extending, strengthening, settling the work which his missionaries had begun. Bede gives us some graphic sketches of the way in which a bishop would ride through the country, attended by his clerks and servants, singing the psalms as they rode; and how the country people would lay down their tools in the field and run to kneel down and ask the bishop's blessing. Some of the bishops used to go on foot on their missionary journeys, after the example of the Apostles. We have seen that Aidan used to do so, and that when King Oswin gave him a horse he gave it away to the first beggar he met. Chad also "used to travel about, not on horseback, but after the manner of the Apostles, on foot, to preach the Gospel in towns, the open country, cottages, villages, and castles, for he was one of the disciples of Aidan, and endeavoured to instruct his people by the same actions and behaviour, according to his and his brother Cedd's example." Theodore bade him ride whenever he had a long journey to undertake, and, finding him very unwilling, he with his own hands helped him on his horse.

But seeing the vast extent of those dioceses, it was as necessary for a Saxon bishop to ride as for a missionary

bishop now of an Australian diocese. Accordingly we find that the bishops commonly travelled on horseback,[1] and with them often a considerable company of priests and clerks, and of young laymen who were under the bishop's care and instructions. We can easily picture to ourselves the company of ecclesiastics and young nobles and their attendants, some on foot, some on horseback, riding along the green bridle-roads, through forest, and over moor, and across ford, singing the "Hours" at the proper times as they rode along. They were not always singing their office; and no doubt, as they rode up hil[l] and down dale, they enjoyed the bright sunshine, and pleasant landscape, and open-air life, and chatted cheerfully with one another. A passage in Bede shows us that they were not insensible to the temptation which a group of young men on horseback naturally feel when they come to a stretch of level turf. One of the priests of John of Beverley tells us how in the prime of youth he lived among that saint's clergy, applying himself to reading and singing, but not having yet altogether withdrawn his heart from youthful pleasures. It happened one day, as they were travelling with the bishop, that they came to a plain and open road, well adapted for galloping their horses. The young men that were with him, and particularly those of the laity, began to entreat the bishop to give them leave to gallop, and make trial of the goodness of their horses. He at first refused, saying it was an idle request, but at last, being prevailed on by their unanimous wishes, he gave them leave, and off they went for a good race across the turf. Our young priest was forbidden to ride with them, but when they had galloped backwards and forwards several times, the bishop and he

[1] Earconwald, Bishop of the East Saxons, being lame, was carried about his diocese in a horse-litter.

looking on, his wanton humour prevailed, and he struck in among them, and rode off at speed with the rest. The bishop called after him, "Alas! how much you grieve me by riding after that manner." But though he heard him he raced on, and immediately his horse threw him, and in falling he hit his head against a stone, and lay motionless. Finding that he could not be moved, they stretched a tent over him and watched over him till evening and then carried him home. And the bishop, expecting his death, would not stay that night as he was wont among his clergy, but spent it alone in watching and prayer, imploring the Divine Goodness for his sick clerk's recovery. Coming to him in the morning early, having first said a prayer over him, he called him by name, and, as it were, waking him out of sleep, asked him "if he knew who it was that spoke to him"; and he opened his eyes and said, "I do: you are my beloved bishop." And the bishop laid his hands on his head with words of blessing and returned to prayer.

Their route did not always lie through quiet places, where they could sing their office without disturbance, or ride races without scandal. They passed through the clearings, where the people were at work in the fields, and so into the villages, which were the objects of their journeys. Bede in another place enables us to follow them there: "The religious habit was at that time in great veneration, so that wheresoever any clergyman or monk happened to come he was joyfully received by all persons as God's servant. And if they chanced to meet him upon the way they ran to him, and were glad to be signed with his hand or blessed with his mouth. And if any priest happened to come into a village, the inhabitants flocked together to hear from him the Word of Life. For the priests and clergymen went into the villages on

no other account than to preach, baptize, visit the sick, and, in few words, to take care of souls."

On their journeys the clergy were accustomed, not only, as we have seen, to say their Hours as they rode, but also daily to celebrate the Holy Communion before they started. This we learn from Bede's account of the two Hewalds, English priests who, about A.D. 690, went as missionaries among the people of Old Saxony. "The barbarians," he says, "found them to be of another religion by their continual prayer and singing of psalms and hymns, and by their daily offering the sacrifice of the daily oblation, for they had with them sacred vessels and a consecrated table for an altar."[1]

It is very interesting to compare this missionary work in England more than a thousand years ago with that which our missionary bishops and clergy are now doing in some of the colonies of England. The work of a Selwyn in New Zealand is the best illustration of that of a Chad in Mercia; and the early history of the Church of England helps us to anticipate the grand results in the future of which we in this generation are laying the foundations in new countries.

The king under whose protection a bishop had been established seems usually to have given him the means of support for himself and his clergy, and in most instances he endowed the see sooner or later with lands. Moreover, the missionaries believed, and taught their converts, that Christ had ordained for the maintenance of His Church a provision similar to that which He had before ordained for the priests and Levites of the Old Testament Church. The inspired Scripture drew the

[1] Such a portable altar, of Saxon date, was found in St. Cuthbert's grave in Durham Cathedral, and is engraved in the Rev. James Raine's 'St. Cuthbert.' Others are noticed in Dr. Rock's 'Church of our Fathers,' I. 250.

parallel, "They who served the altar lived of the altar, and so they who preached the Gospel should live of the Gospel." They taught that this parallelism extended to the proportion of the provision that was to be made, so that it was every Christian man's duty to give a tithe of his substance to God. We are told that obedience to this doctrine came the easier to the Saxons because they had been accustomed to give a tithe of their substance to their heathen priests. This tithe at first was all paid into a common fund, which was under the control of the bishop.

Though the Churches of the Conversion were independent, they naturally grouped themselves round two great centres—those which sprang from the missionaries of Iona round Lindisfarne, and those which followed the Italian usages round the see of Canterbury. The points of difference between them were small matters of ecclesiastical detail, such as those which had been in debate between Augustine and the British Church; the mode of making the tonsure and the time of keeping Easter were the chief ostensible subjects of debate. No doubt the latter caused some inconvenience, and it was brought home to King Oswy of Northumbria in a very striking way, for his wife, Eanfleda, the daughter of Edwin and Ethelburga, had been brought up in the Italian customs, while he had embraced the Celtic customs; consequently it sometimes happened at Oswy's court that the king was celebrating the great Easter feast while his queen was keeping the solemn and penitential season of Lent. Probably the matter at issue went deeper than this, and involved the point of honour whether the Celtic Churches should or should not, by giving way, acknowledge a certain superiority of the see

of Canterbury. The differences of custom must have caused a good deal of confusion throughout Northumbria. Jacob, the deacon who had been left behind by Paulinus, taught the Roman customs to his converts; so did Romanus, the queen's chaplain; so did the able and energetic Wilfrid, who was the friend of Alchfrid, the king's son; and Wilfrid was introducing a spirit of acerbity and intolerance into the question, when Oswy was induced to hold a conference at Whitby, heard what both sides had to say on the subject, and decided to adopt the customs of the rest of the Western world. Whereupon Colman (who had succeeded Finan in the see of Northumbria) retired with some of his adherents to Scotland, while the rest of the Celtic clergy of his kingdom accepted the decision of Oswy. Cedd, bishop of the East Saxons, happened to be present at the conference at Whitby, and he also adopted the Continental customs.

CHAPTER IX

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

We now arrive at one of the chief turning points in the history of the English Church. On the death of Deusdedit, the sixth Archbishop of Canterbury (664 A.D.), Egbert, King of Kent, and Oswy, King of Northumbria, the great patrons of the two schools—the Italian and the Celtic—consulted together on the affairs of the Churches, and, with the consent of the Churches themselves, agreed to take steps to arrive at a uniformity of customs throughout England. It is evident that the Celtic party, which had already yielded on the Easter question, was prepared to make further concessions on the points in which they differed from nearly all the other Churches of Europe. They agreed to select a man in whom both parties had confidence, and to send him to Rome, to which all the semi-barbarous nations of the north and west looked up as the ideal of learning and orthodoxy, that he might come back with all the experience to be gathered in the imperial city, and with all the prestige of consecration by the Bishop of the most famous see of Christendom, and then regulate the affairs of the English Churches. They chose Wighard, an Englishman by birth, who had been one of the chaplains of Archbishop Deusdedit, and sent him with attendants and presents—"many vessels of silver and gold"—to Rome. He arrived at Rome, and was kindly received by Pope Vitalian; but before his consecration he and most of his companions died of a

pestilence which happened at the time. To avoid further delay the English Churches requested Vitalian to select another man. They no doubt saw that their object would be still better attained if the Bishop of Rome should induce some distinguished man, to whom all would defer, to undertake the task of setting in order the affairs of these rude and remote Churches.[1] The action which he took honestly and effectually furthered the object in view. Some writers have represented that the Pope sought to establish his supremacy over the English Churches; but there seems no good reason to suspect that Vitalian acted otherwise than in perfect good faith in the matter. The man selected was not at all a likely man to carry out any ambitious designs on the part of Rome; and we shall see in the sequel that he acted with perfect independence, and when the occasion arose declined to defer to the judgment of the Roman see in a matter relating to the discipline of the Church of England. It is not possible to doubt that the Pope knew quite well, from the official letters sent, and from his communications with Wighard and his companions, what was the object of the kings and the Churches. His choice was a judicious one, and the result was in every way successful.

In fact there was some difficulty in inducing any of the distinguished Roman ecclesiastics to undertake the task. The Pope first selected Hadrian, the abbot of a monastery near Naples, an African by birth, a man famous for classical learning and for knowledge both of

[1] Our colonial Churches of to-day, with English clergymen of their own of University training and home experience, are nevertheless often glad to leave it to the Archbishop of Canterbury to select a bishop for them out of the Church of England at home, and it is often difficult to induce any distinguished English clergyman to undertake the laborious duty.

monastic discipline and of Church affairs. But Hadrian begged to be excused, and named a monk named Andrew, who by all who knew him was judged worthy of a bishopric. But Andrew also begged to be excused, and the Pope pressed the duty again upon Hadrian. He obtained a respite for a time to see if he could find another substitute, and at length suggested a Greek monk of his acquaintance, called Theodore, as a suitable man.

Theodore was a native of Tarsus, the birthplace of St. Paul, which was still, as in St. Paul's time, a Greek city in the midst of a rude population, and the great commercial city of the eastern end of the Mediterranean. He had already acquired at Constantinople such a reputation for learning as to be called "Theodore the Philosopher" before he came to Rome. His coming to Rome was at the same time that the Emperor Constans II. visited it, and perhaps he came in the Emperor's train. He was now 66 years old. All these circumstances made Theodore a most unlikely person to be selected by a Pope of Rome to carry out any policy of promoting the supremacy of the Church of Rome over other Churches. In the first place, Theodore was a Greek; in the second place, if he had been in the train of Constans his orthodoxy was not above suspicion, for during his middle-life the Eastern Church had been shaken to its centre by the monothelite heresy, and the Emperor had taken part in the controversy, and issued two famous edicts which displayed a leaning to the heretical opinions. This Eastern monk, this "philosopher," patronized by Constans, was, therefore, a suspicious person in the eyes of the Bishop of Rome. But Hadrian knew him well, and vouched for him; and at length Vitalian reluctantly accepted him on condition

that Hadrian would go with him to England, and help him in his work, and take care that he did not, "according to the custom of the Greeks, introduce anything contrary to the true faith in the Church over which he presided."

Soon after Archbishop Theodore's arrival he made a general visitation of the whole of England, and his authority was universally recognized. In the year 673 A.D. he summoned a council of the English Churches at Hertford, which was attended by all the English bishops and a great number of the clergy; and then with unanimous consent a uniformity of customs as to the time of Easter, &c., was adopted, the rights of the several Churches were regulated, and their confederation into one province, under the Archbishop of Canterbury as Metropolitan, was assented to. The several Churches, with their different nationalities between which were frequent wars, with their different religious customs and mutual ecclesiastical jealousies, were thus organized into what was virtually a National Church. It is very worthy of note that the unity of the Church preceded the unity of the kingdom by 150 years; for it was not till the year 828 A.D. that Egbert, King of Wessex, had reduced by conquest the other kingdoms, and became the first ruler of the whole of England.

Theodore and Hadrian, both eminent scholars, gave a great impulse to the cultivation of learning throughout England. Through their influence, and partly by help of their personal teaching, the monasteries, and even the nunneries, became schools of learning. Bede says that in his time there were scholars of Theodore and Hadrian who were as well versed in Greek and Latin as in their own tongue. In Bede's time the eyes of learned men throughout Western Christendom were attracted to the

monasteries of Deira, partly, indeed, by the vast reputation and wonderfully rapid circulation of his own Ecclesiastical History. Archbishop Egbert founded a noble library at York, and taught in the schools; scholars flocked to them. These schools produced Alcuin, one of the greatest scholars of his age. It happened that this brightest period of Saxon learning coincided with the darkest period of literature among the Franks. Charlemagne invited Alcuin to his court, and in him England repaid the debt which it owed to the Gallican Church in past ages.

When the Churches had been thus organized into one united Church, Theodore proceeded next to the important step of a subdivision of the dioceses.[1] This was not effected without some opposition, and one instance of this opposition we shall have presently to mention. Hitherto each king had had his bishop, and no doubt there was a good deal to be said in favour of the maintenance of the arrangement. To subdivide the sees would be to diminish the prestige and influence of the episcopate, it would even seem like breaking up the unity of the national Churches, and altering their very constitution. But it was manifest that now the whole population had become Christian, their adequate supervision needed a larger number of bishops, each acting within a more manageable area, and Theodore persisted in his plan. In 673, the year of the council of Hertford, he divided East Anglia into two sees at Elmham and Dunwich. Soon after he constituted Hereford and Worcester. In 678 he divided the see of Northumbria, notwithstanding the opposition of Wilfrid, its bishop, into four—York, Hexham, Lindisfarne, and Lindsey—besides

[1] Kent had been divided by Augustine in 604 A.D., by the erection of a second see at Rochester.

reviving the ancient British diocese of Whithern, and consecrating a see at Sidnacester for the province of Lindsey, lately transferred by conquest from Mercia to Northumbria.[1] The initiation of the parochial subdivision of the dioceses is also commonly attributed, with some probability, but without any positive authority, to Theodore. He, it is said, encouraged the thanes to build churches on their estates for the honour of God, and the comfort of themselves and their people, and to provide dwelling-houses for the clergymen to live in. As an inducement, he is said to have permitted that every thane so doing should in future pay the tithe of his manor to his own pastor instead of sending it to the bishop's common fund; and, further, that he should select his own pastor out of the general body of the clergy. The system thus commenced or promoted by Theodore was gradually carried out over the whole

[1] The following list of Saxon sees may be useful to the reader :—

KINGDOMS.	SEES.	
Kent . . .	Canterbury	
	Rochester	
East Saxons. .	London	
East Angles. .	Dunwich	
	Elmham	
West Saxons .	Winchester	
	Sherborne	
	Crediton	founded about 909.
	Wells	
	Ramsbury	
	Cornwall	
Mercia . .	Lichfield	
	Hereford	
	Worcester	
	Lindsey (Sidnacester)	
	Leicester, removed to Dorchester about 870.	
South Saxons .	Selsey	
Northumbria .	York	
	Lindisfarne	
	Hexham	
	Whithern.	

kingdom, so that by the time of the Norman Conquest the diocesan and parochial organization of the Church of England was completed.

Our existing constitution in Church and State thus gradually and naturally grew. Each kingdom at first was the bishop's diocese, and when the dioceses were divided by Theodore he followed the divisions of the sub-kingdoms. The first bishops did not begin their work without the permission of the kings, the kings when converted endowed the sees out of their own property, and thus the patronage of the sees, *i. e.* the approval of one of the clergy to succeed to a vacant see, came naturally into the hands of the several kings, and so into the hand of the king of the whole country. When the king was a pious one, he had regard to the choice of the diocesan clergy; if he were a self-willed king, he appointed his bishops without seeking any one's consent; but the appointment of the Archbishop of Canterbury seems usually to have received the sanction of the great council of the nation. The township became the sphere of duty of a single priest, and later it was called his parish, and he was called its rector. The landowners gave their tithe willingly for the support of religion, and after a while the law recognized and protected the right of the clergy to these endowments. The thane selected his own parish priest out of the body of the clergy, and so the patronage of the benefice continued to be vested as of right in the lord of the manor. The bishop still retained a number of the clergy about him in the cathedral city, and as things began to get into permanent order their position gradually became defined. The number of clergy on the cathedral establishment became settled, a rule of life was drawn up for them, and they were organized into a collegiate body with a dean and

other officers. The estates of these clerks ultimately became separated from those of the bishop; married clerks or canons lived in separate houses. Anybody who liked established a monastery, and adopted his own rule and regulations for it, but they were all under the supervision of the bishop.

"Church and State" had then a deeper meaning than the phrase can have now. The two powers were everywhere co-ordinate. In the council the bishops and abbots sat with the other notables and assisted in making laws; the same assembly seems often to have considered both civil laws and ecclesiastical canons. The bishop sat beside the shire reeve (sheriff) in administering the laws; the parish priest led the people of his township to the hundred moot. For the clergy were not foreigners, nor a separate caste; their interests and those of the people were the same. The people looked up to and trusted the clergy. Jealousies between Church and State were the growth of subsequent times and other circumstances; and dissent was unknown in England for 1500 years after Christ.

This sketch of the origin of our ecclesiastical constitution would be incomplete without a few words as to the subsequent division of the Church into two provinces, of Canterbury and York. When Gregory sent his mission to England, he laid down large plans for the future ecclesiastical constitution of the country. There were to be two provinces, of London and York, each consisting of twelve dioceses. Augustine was to be the Primate for his lifetime, and after his death the senior by consecration of the two archbishops. We have seen that at the death of Augustine the Church was still limited to Kent; the independent sources of the conversion of the other

kingdoms did not tend to their recognition of any obedience to the Kentish see. Theodore was the first bishop who was recognized and obeyed as archbishop by all the Heptarchic Churches.

In 735 A.D., however, circumstances led to the realization in a modified way of Gregory's idea of a division of England into two provinces. At that time Northumbria was the most powerful of the Heptarchic kingdoms; its Church was flourishing; Egbert, a member of the royal family, and a man of great learning, was Bishop of York. The schools of York were famous throughout Western Christendom. Bede had recently published his ecclesiastical history, containing the letters of Gregory the Great, with copies of which Nothelm, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, had supplied him, and so had made known the original plan of a northern province. The Archbishop of Canterbury made no opposition; and so it was arranged that York should be erected into a metropolitan see, embracing the sees of the Northumbrian kingdom—York, Hexham, Lindisfarne, and Whithern. The king, unwilling that his archbishop should be in any mark of dignity inferior to other metropolitans, bade Bishop Egbert apply to the Bishop of Rome for the honour of the pall, which was granted, and he was recognized as Archbishop of York.

In another half-century, Mercia, under King Offa, made conquest of Kent, Wessex, and East Anglia, and, in its turn, became the leading kingdom. Offa thought that it became his dignity to have his chief see, Lichfield, erected into a metropolitan see, having Mercia for its province. He seized all the property of the see of Canterbury which was within the kingdom of Mercia to increase the endowments of Lichfield. On application to Rome for the honour of the pall, the Pope sent

two legates to England, who passed through Kent, visited Northumbria, and were everywhere well received. They attended a council which was held at Cealchythe (Chelsea?), 785 A.D.; but they did not assume to preside at the council, or take any ostensible part in it. The council consented to the wishes of Offa—the Archbishop of Canterbury not venturing for political reasons to make any open opposition—and sanctioned the erection of Lichfield into a metropolitan see over the dioceses of Mercia, viz., Lichfield, Hereford, Worcester, Lindsey, and Leicester. Thus each of the leading kingdoms in turn assumed for its chief church this metropolitan organization and dignity. The province of Lichfield, however, lasted but a short time. After eighteen years another council at Cloveshoo reversed the decision of Cealchythe, and Canterbury regained its authority over the whole Church south of the Humber.

When Wessex in turn brought the other kingdoms into subjection, and its sovereigns, retaining the title of kings of Wessex, and leaving the other kingdoms to be governed by their own under-kings, were yet virtually kings of England, they did not follow the example of Northumbria and Mercia, but left the organization of the Church undisturbed.

The invasion, conquest, and permanent settlement of the Danes in England must not be passed by in silence, though it is remarkable how little permanent trace they have left in the history of the Church of England. The Saxon chronicle records in 787, in the reign of Offa, the arrival of three ships of Northmen—"the first ships of Danish men which sought the land of the English nation." These were the harbingers of the last great descent of the northern barbarians. For several generations during the 9th century Denmark and Scandinavia continued

to pour out hordes of pirates distinguished by warlike force and courage, by merciless ferocity, and by hatred of Christianity. The Saxons suffered in their turn the miseries they had inflicted upon the Britons. The country was repeatedly ravaged, the cities sacked and sometimes burnt, churches and monasteries burnt, whole provinces laid waste. The fierce struggle was protracted by alternate fortunes; now all resistance was overcome, and Alfred was in hiding, and the land was at the mercy of the freebooters; again the Danes were defeated, and compelled to settle in the north-eastern districts, and to embrace Christianity, as Charlemagne had imposed it on the Saxons of Ost and Westphalia, probably as a means of reclaiming them from their barbarism. Fresh invaders were aided by an outbreak of the settled Danes, and after renewed struggles the kingdom was divided between Edmund Ironside and Canute the King of Denmark. At length the north ceased to send forth fresh swarms; the two races began to settle down side by side; the Danes learnt the religion of the English; the churches were rebuilt; the results of a century of strife and confusion, and the destruction of the seats of learning, were seen in the want of learning of the clergy; but by the time of the Conquest the constitution of the Church and the religion of the people bore little trace of this long contest. In the person of Edward the Confessor, the heir of Cerdic was once more on the throne, and it was only in the more stalwart persons and different dialect and peculiar customs of the men of the Danelagh that the traces of the Danish invasion remained discernible.

So much for the outward organization of the Anglo-Saxon Church: what were the doctrines which it held and taught? We have seen what curiously various

elements were concerned in the planting of this Church of England: Augustine and his Italians; Birinus the Italian, whose work was followed up by Agilbert, the Frenchman with an Irish training; Aidan and his Scots; Felix the Burgundian, helped by Fursey the Irishman; Wilfrid the Northumbrian with a Roman training; all harmonized and organized into a united Church of England by Theodore the Asiatic Greek and Hadrian the African. What differences there were between one school of thought and another, between Augustine and the British, between the Italians and the Scots, all related to minor questions of ecclesiastical detail—a blunder in the calculation of Easter-day, a difference in the shape of a tonsure. Among all these varied elements we hear of no differences of doctrine, and only of partial and occasional differences of opinion and feeling. Before the end of the Saxon period Rome had begun to put forth her pretensions to supremacy, and some of the corrupt doctrines of the mediæval Church had begun to be spread abroad. But the Anglo-Saxon nation and the Anglo-Saxon Church had wonderfully little intercourse with the rest of the world, and her mere isolation and old-fashionedness preserved her from the inroad of the new ideas; while her constitution in Church and State, and the simple habits of the people, had preserved the Church from the moral corruption and the ecclesiastical abuses with which the continental Churches were deeply gangrened.

There is an impression in the minds of many people that we owe our religion almost entirely to Augustine, who, having been sent by Pope Gregory, necessarily, they suppose, made the Church of England subject to the See of Rome, and introduced Roman Catholic doctrine. From this impression some very important

practical deductions are drawn. On one side there is the deduction that the sentiments of gratitude and loyalty ought to induce us very strongly to admit the claims of Rome to the obedience of England. Such sentiments might have some weight with regard to the county of Kent, but they have no foundation with respect to the rest of Saxon England, or to Cornwall and Wales. We have seen that in those days when the English Church looked up to Rome with deserved veneration, she yet steadily repudiated all notion of subjection to her. In the whole course of Saxon Church History only one man, Wilfrid of York, made an attempt to appeal to Rome as to a superior authority. He appealed twice; on both occasions the appeal was distinctly refused, and the appellant was punished for making the appeal as for an act of disloyalty.

Again, people often take for granted that the property of the Church of England was acquired when the Church was Roman Catholic, and that the Roman Catholics have therefore a sort of equitable claim to it, on the ground that it was given by people who held their doctrines for the purpose of preaching and maintaining their doctrines and worship. The truth is, that nearly all the property which the Church at present possesses was acquired either before the Norman Conquest or since the Reformation. The episcopal and capitular estates, tithes, and most of the glebe lands were given by the Saxon kings and landowners before there were any "Roman Catholics" in the modern sense of the word. The parsonage houses have been rebuilt by the clergy since the Reformation; most of the churches have had so much spent upon their maintenance and restoration since the Reformation as to give the present Church of England a very fair equitable title to them on that ground; and

much more of Church property has been added since the Reformation than people generally are aware of. The property which the Church acquired during the period from the Conquest to the Reformation, when people were growing more and more "Roman Catholic," consisted chiefly of the property of the monasteries and the endowments of chantries; of all this she was deprived again at the Reformation—and at that same period she was deprived of many a manor with which the Saxon kings and nobles had endowed her bishops and cathedrals, and of the great tithes of nearly half the parishes of England.

CHAPTER X

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPACY

We are about to enter upon the next great turning point in the history of the Church of England, when she was brought under the spiritual supremacy of Rome, and thrown open to the influence of the ideas which were current on the continent of Europe. It becomes therefore necessary to an intelligent comprehension of this phase of our own history that we should have some preliminary knowledge of the condition of the continental Churches.

We had occasion to point out in a previous chapter now at the time of the Saxon conversion the several Churches were independent of one another, and all held substantially the same doctrines which had been handed down from the early ages of the Church. During the interval between that period and the period at which we have now arrived—between the 7th century and the 11th—Europe had passed through the darkest ages of its history.

During the 9th and 10th centuries the continental Churches had fallen into great corruption. The episcopal sees had gradually become offices of so great wealth and power that the princes into whose patronage they had fallen endowed the members of their own families with them, or bestowed them as rewards of service or gifts of favour upon men who were often very unfit to fulfil the spiritual duties of the offices. It naturally followed that

ambitious men sought these great prizes by unworthy means, by intrigue and bribery. The Roman see itself during the latter part of the 9th, and the first half of the 10th century affords the most terrible example of the corruption into which the Church of Christ had fallen. Baronius, one of the great Roman Catholic historians, describes the whole Church during the 9th and 10th centuries as "exceedingly foul." He says that in that period no less than fifty Popes succeeded one another on the Pontifical throne, "of whom many secured possession of it by fraud, by money, or by worse expedients." And many of them lived lives of open and extreme profligacy. Similar, if not equally great, corruption existed all over the continental Church. Simony was almost universal. Men took Orders only to enable themselves legally to hold Church benefices, and lived like laymen. Ecclesiastics of this character could not be expected to be successful in the spiritual work of the Church and in the care of souls; and so learning grew scarce and discipline lax among the clergy; the people were neglected and grew up ignorant and irreligious. There was a strong tendency in feudal times to make all offices hereditary. Why should not a prince-bishop, who was much more a sovereign prince than a Christian bishop, transmit his possessions and dignity to his son, as other princes did? why should not an archdeaconry be hereditary like a seneschalship? why should not a benefice be transferred to the heir on payment of fine to the lord just as the rest of his fiefs were? This treatment of Church benefices had already begun, and the Church was threatened with general secularization.

In the latter part of the 10th century a spirit of reform sprang up in the Roman Church, and a desire for the correction of these abuses began to prevail far and wide.

The pretensions of the Popes of the 11th century received so much support, and had so great a success, because these Popes put themselves at the head of the reforming party in the Church, espoused the interests of the Christian laity against the vices of the hierarchy, and asserted the rights of the Church against the abuse of their patronage by the kings and princes. The powers which the Popes claimed seemed to offer the only means of effecting the desired reforms, and removing the causes which had led to the universal corruption. It is very curious, but it is true, that the strength of the ultramontane movement in its rise was that the Papacy was reforming and democratic.

This new epoch in the Church begins with Pope Leo IX., in the year 1049, and extends through the papacies of Victor II., Stephen IX., Benedict X., Nicholas II., and Alexander II., who was Pope at the time of the Norman Conquest of England. During the reign of these Popes, Hildebrand was the guiding and animating soul of the reforming party, and had long been virtually the ruling head of the Roman Church before he succeeded Alexander in the Papal chair, under the name of Gregory VII. This remarkable man has been the object of extravagant veneration on one side, and of extravagant abuse and hatred on the other. That he was a man of extraordinary genius is allowed on all sides. He seems to have been of ascetic purity, of entire personal disinterestedness; but, blinded by the grand ideal which he had conceived of a universal theocracy to be wielded by the Bishops of Rome, he disregarded all rights of Church and State which were inconsistent with the fulfilment of this ideal. Assume his principles to be true, and it is possible to admire the energy and consistency with which he carried them out; but since his principles

were wrong, those acts were consequently wrong, and his energy becomes unscrupulous tyranny and wrong-doing.

In a previous chapter (chapter IV.) we have traced the gradual development of the organization of the Church, and have seen how Gregory the Great, in denying to the see of Constantinople, had repudiated for the see of Rome, any claim to a universal headship of the Church. But for some generations after the publication of the pseudo-Isidorian decretals in the latter half of the 9th century, the see of Rome gradually pressed forward the claim to an ultimate appellate jurisdiction, and consequently to the headship of the Church. The Roman theologians had put this claim, not on the ground that such an organization had gradually grown up and was practically advantageous, and thereupon ought to be accepted by all Christian people, but they had declared it to be of Divine right. Christ, they asserted, had given to Peter and his successors a supremacy over the Church; and the Popes of Rome were the successors of Peter; and so they claimed, as of Divine right, that the Pope was the centre of Christian unity, and the head of the Church on earth, and the representative and vicegerent of Jesus Christ her Lord. But the genius of Hildebrand had gone beyond even this, and had conceived the idea of making the Papacy a universal monarchy. No doubt the idea was one of dazzling grandeur, and was supported by considerations of a kind which have great attractions for some minds. Taking for granted that the Papal supremacy was of Divine right, the rest followed easily. Christ had given to the successors of St. Peter authority to rule the Universal Church. Now kings rule over nations, which are only provinces of Christendom; and they rule only over

temporal things, which are as inferior to spiritual things as the body is inferior to the soul. Therefore the spiritual sovereign of the whole of the kingdom of Christ must be the superior of these mere temporal sovereigns of its parts. Moreover kings and princes are beyond question the spiritual sons and subjects of the Church, and ought therefore to look upon the Pope as their father and lord. This universal spiritual sovereignty had many obvious benefits to offer to mankind. There is no denying that the Church of the Middle Ages, with all its faults, was the protector of the people against the violence and rapacity of their feudal lords; and the beneficent action of this spiritual sovereignty was at once manifested in the hands of Gregory VII. by his effectual protection of subjects from the oppression of their princes, whom no other earthly power pretended the right, or possessed the inclination, to control. This sovereignty also afforded that international tribunal for the peaceful settlement of the disputes of kings and nations, for which we have not yet invented any efficient substitute. The laws of all Christian nations are professedly based upon the Divine law; what more reasonable than that there should be an appeal from the administrators of these narrower national laws to the acknowledged sovereign guardian and interpreter of the law of Christ? was it not a fulfilment of the Gospel command, "Tell him his fault before two or three witnesses," *i. e.* the minor authorities of your nation; "if he will not hear them, tell it to the Church," *i. e.* to the sovereign Pontiff, the head of the Church; "and if he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican," *i. e.* let him be excommunicated? For that was the coercive power of this spiritual kingdom. A Pope might indeed occasionally commission two or three kings to enforce a

judgment by arms against a rebellious prince, but his true weapon—that which he ordinarily used and found sufficient—was the sentence of excommunication against an individual, and the corresponding sentence of interdict against a kingdom.

This Hildebrandine theory was certainly a grand one, and found a wide acceptance, and had a great influence on the affairs of men and nations in the Middle Ages. It has been revived even in our own days by the encyclical of 1864, and is honestly believed by men of high culture to be the only refuge from the infidelity and anarchy which now seem to them to threaten Christendom. The subject is, therefore, not only one of historical interest but of practical importance. This idea of a theocracy was a grand idea, but it was a false one. There is no such idea to be found in the New Testament. There was no such idea in the mind of the early Church. It was never heard of till the Church of Christ had existed more than a thousand years. It has always been resisted in the Western Church from that day to this; and it has never been admitted for a moment in the other branches of the Church. It was based on the doctrine of the Papal supremacy, which again was based on the forged decretals of Isidore, supported by *ex post facto* interpretations of one or two texts of Scripture. It had to get over as it could such texts as "My kingdom is not of this world," "Render therefore to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers, the powers that be are ordained of God," and such like. And however beneficent the sway of a universal monarchy might be, Gregory had no more right to seek to attain it, in the name of religion, by fraud and usurpation, than Napoleon, in the name of liberty and fraternity, by force

of arms. A very short experience was enough to prove that such a power could be no more safely entrusted to a bishop than to a layman, to a line of Popes than to a line of Cæsars.

Hildebrand set himself to work out his idea by a bold assertion of his claim, and by a skilful use in its support of all the opportunities which the politics of the world afforded him. Did two sovereigns quarrel and refer their dispute to the arbitration of the Bishop of Rome, the Pope gave his decision in the tone of their common superior. Did a conqueror or usurper feel that his title would be strengthened by the sanctions of religion, the Pope confirmed his title in words which implied that he exercised the power of a superior granting a fief. Let a tyrant, in danger of being dethroned by his outraged subjects, appeal to the Pope for assistance, and he would support him in his kingdom on condition that he would consent to hold it of the Papal see, and overawe his rebels by threats of interdict.

These general remarks will explain a whole series of transactions in our English history, to which we now return.

CHAPTER XI

THE NORMAN CONQUEST

When the empire of Charlemagne was broken up, there was but little political intercourse between any of the nations of Europe in the 9th and 10th centuries, though that empire left among the dismembered kingdoms some sort of sentiment of federal relation, which laid the foundation of the political system of modern Europe. But England had not been included within the Frankish empire; and the English people, owing to their insular position and their difference of race, language, and laws, were especially secluded from the rest of the world. The Churches of the Continent maintained a rather considerable mutual intercourse, but the English Church had little correspondence with the other Churches. In the age of Bede and Alcuin there was some correspondence between learned ecclesiastics. On two or three occasions legates came from Rome, but it was as inquirers or ambassadors, not yet claiming any authority. Two or three English bishops visited Italy, and were hospitably entertained at the Lateran; but English bishops were a greater rarity in the councils of the 7th to the 11th centuries than British bishops had been in those of the 4th. The Danish invasions harried the English Church for a whole century, and after that time the English bishops and clergy were an unlearned, homely, pious people, with very little in common with the secularized prelates and worldly-

minded clergy of Italy, Germany, and France. Edward the Confessor, with his Norman education and predilections, had introduced the French language at court, and put some Norman favourites into high offices; but had only thereby created a patriotic dislike of foreigners among the Saxon nobles and people. The Norman Conquest introduced England again, as the Roman Conquest had originally done, into the family of European nations, and threw her wide open to the influx of the continental ideas as represented by the conquering Norman race.

The Norman was perhaps at this time the most vigorous race in Christendom. Its bold northern valour and spirit of enterprise were being tempered and refined into the spirit of chivalry. Moreover, in throwing aside their ancestral heathenism, the Normans had embraced Christianity with the zeal of new converts, and were an eminently religious people. The monasteries of Caen and Bec had acquired great reputation under Lanfranc and Anselm as schools of learning, and they were on the side of the reforming party in the Church.

While William's conquest was still precarious, and he was trying to conciliate the nation, he paid studious respect to Archbishop Stigand and to the Church; and after he had entered on a stern and unsparing policy towards the conquered people, he still seems to have sincerely aimed at promoting the true interests of the nation through the Church. He filled the sees and abbeys with Normans; but his Church appointments were generally good. He did not quarrel with his bishops, and leave the sees and abbeys vacant, like his successor. His nobles generally followed his example. Summing up the Norman period—*i. e.* to the end of the 12th century—in a sentence, the Normans founded

abbeys and brought over monks of the reformed orders to fill them; they filled the land with cathedrals, abbeys, and churches, in an improved style of architecture, and on a scale of grandeur hitherto unseen in England; in short, they brought in the learning and science, the architecture and ritual, the spirituality and energy which had been lately attained by the foremost spirits of the age, to elevate a Church which had grown torpid and backward by lying out of reach of the great movements of European thought in this remote and isolated corner of Christendom.

On the other hand, this throwing open of the Church of England brought it at once within the range of the Hildebrandine aggression, which was the great movement of the age; and introduced, in the person of the Norman archbishop, Lanfranc, a champion of that doctrine of the Eucharist which was one of the first corruptions of the mediæval faith.

The very first event which we have to record after the Conquest is the putting forth of the boldest claim of the Pope, to be not only the head of the Church, but also the suzerain of the kingdom of England. When Edward the Confessor died, and Harold succeeded him by the election of the people, William appealed to the Pope, Alexander II., on the subject of the English succession. He stated that Edward had nominated him by will to be his successor, and that Harold had formerly solemnly sworn to aid him to the peaceful succession. This was an ecclesiastical question—a question of the validity of a testament and the obligation of an oath. William had previously acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Roman see in such questions when he sought the Papal dispensation for his marriage with Matilda of Flanders; and William, like all the princes of his time, was thank-

ful to obtain, when he could, the great moral support of the countenance of the Holy See. The Pope gave his decision in favour of William, and proceeded to afford him all the moral support in his power. He excommunicated Harold and his abettors; he bade William take possession of the crown by force of arms; he proclaimed the war which he should undertake for the purpose a holy war, and gave him a banner, embroidered with a cross and blessed by the Pope, as the standard of this crusade.

Next year Hildebrand himself succeeded to the Papal chair under the title of Gregory VII., and shortly after sent a nuncio to William, demanding that he should do homage for his crown, and pay the Peter Pence which Rome had been accustomed to receive from England. This was the condition on which the Roman court had consented to maintain William's claim; very possibly the condition was not expressed, but was tacitly assumed on the part of Rome. William had appealed to the assumed authority of the Pope over the affairs of nations; he effected the conquest under the Pope's banner; he could not with a good grace repudiate the Papal claims when he had thus appealed to, and acted under, and profited by them. Consistency and gratitude seemed to bind him to accede to the Pope's demand. But William was not a prince to yield to such a claim, or allow himself to be entangled by such sophistries. He acknowledged the Pope to be the head of the Church, and had appealed to him on a great ecclesiastical question. To acknowledge him as his feudal superior for the kingdom which he had inherited from Edward, and taken possession of with his sword, was quite another question. His plain and peremptory refusal of the Pope's demand is on record, and is worth giving:—

"Thy legate, Hubert, Holy Father, hath called upon me in thy name to take the oath of fealty to thee and to thy successors, and to exert myself in enforcing the more regular payment of the money which my predecessors were accustomed to remit to the Church of Rome. One request I have granted, the other I refuse. Homage to thee I have not chosen, nor do I choose, to do. I never made a promise to that effect, neither do I find that it was ever performed by my predecessors to thine."

To William, however, we owe the acknowledged subjection of the Church of England to the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see. When the rebellion of 1069 had provoked him, or given him the pretext, to treat the English as a conquered people, he proceeded to effect such changes as he desired in the Church. The first step was to place the Church under the authority of the Pope and to get rid of Archbishop Stigand. William solicited the Pope to send two legates to hold a council of the Church and make provision for its regulation. Two cardinals accordingly presided at a synod at Winchester in 1070. It was the first time the Pope's right to exercise jurisdiction in the affairs of the English Church had been admitted. The ostensible charges against the patriotic archbishop were three in number: (1) That he had held the Bishopric of Winchester with Canterbury (the practice was only too common throughout the Church); (2) That he had officiated in the pall of his predecessor; and (3) That he had received his own pall from the anti-Pope Benedict. On these charges he was deposed, and Lanfranc was consecrated in his stead. In this appointment the Conqueror passed over his half-brother Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, who perhaps had been contemplated for this

powerful position, and did well for the Church by giving her the ablest ecclesiastic in Normandy.

By birth an Italian, a native of Pavia, Lanfranc had studied law in the famous schools of that city; subsequently he removed to Avranches, in Normandy, where he established a school and obtained a considerable reputation as a teacher. Here he passed through a religious crisis, which led him to abandon the world. Wandering through the forest from Avranches, he came by accident upon the monastery of Bec, then newly founded, and in its primitive state of poverty and spirituality. He became a monk of the house; scholars attracted by his fame came to Bec, and the house was rebuilt on a larger scale. He was elected prior. Anselm, his successor, came as one of his scholars, was induced to join the community, and assisted Lanfranc in his teaching. Some strong words which Lanfranc had used against Duke William's breach of the ecclesiastical laws in marrying Matilda were reported to the duke, who bade him quit his dominions. On his way he met the duke, some conversation ensued, the result of which was that Lanfranc was sent to Rome to negotiate the obtaining of a dispensation. One of the conditions on which the dispensation was granted was, that William and Matilda should each found an abbey. These abbeys were both erected at Caen, and William desired Lanfranc to take charge of his monastery of St. Stephen. Here again his reputation for learning and wisdom grew; and he was offered and refused the position of Archbishop of Rouen, the head of the Church of Normandy. After the Conquest William nominated him to the government of the Church of England, which also he at first refused, but on this occasion he was not excused. He resisted the repeated commands of the king, and the entreaties

of the queen, but he yielded at length in deference to the wishes of the Pope, Alexander II., an old friend and pupil of his own at Bec. An abbot and scholar of sixty-six years of age might well shrink from the task of ruling the Church in so distracted a State as England. But his was perhaps the best appointment the Conqueror could have made. He was not only a man of learning and ascetic piety, but he had the practical wisdom which the office and the crisis required. Like the rest of the continental churchmen of the time, he believed in the appellate jurisdiction of the see of Rome; but he had been trained in an Imperial city, and his family had probably had to leave it through their adherence to the Imperialist side in the quarrel between the Emperor and the Pope; and he did not accept the Hildebrandine claim of universal sovereignty.

The policy of the Church of England during the Conqueror's reign bears the impress of Lanfranc's character. The initiative may very probably have been taken in many cases by the king, but it had the concurrence of the archbishop. They maintained with a high hand the prerogative of the Crown against the claims of the Pope. The Church was forbidden to recognize either of the rival Popes who at that time divided Christendom, without the king's decision. No letters were to be received from Rome without the king's leave. No ecclesiastic was to quit the kingdom without the king's leave. The Church was to make no canons without the king's consent. The king told Lanfranc he intended to have all the crosiers in the kingdom in his own hand. No sentence of ecclesiastical censure was to be passed on any of the king's chief vassals (tenants *in capite*) without the king's precept.

Another practical improvement was the transfer of

the sees of several of the bishoprics. The Gallican bishops had their sees in the principal cities, but the English sees had been founded for the most part in monasteries and smaller towns. The Synod of London, 1075, wisely transferred some of them to the principal cities within their jurisdiction: Sherborne to Old Sarum (afterwards removed with the transfer of the population to Salisbury); Selsey to Chichester; Lichfield to Chester (afterwards to Coventry in 1095); Elmham to Thetford (moved again to Norwich in 1094); and subsequently, in 1095, Dorchester to Lincoln.

Four Saxon bishops, including Stigand, and a few abbots, were displaced by the Conqueror; the Confessor had already made several foreign bishops, and vacancies were filled up by Normans.

Another important change was in the administration of the law. We have seen that in Saxon times there was no distinction between the lay and the spiritual courts. In the same court, in which both churchmen and laymen sat, were decided both lay and ecclesiastical causes. William and Lanfranc introduced the continental system, better adapted no doubt to the more complex affairs of a more artificial civilization, by separating the civil from the ecclesiastical courts.

A general improvement was introduced in the form and method of rendering the Divine service. We may give the whole story as an illustration of the high-handed way in which the government both of Church and State was carried on.

One of the Saxon prelates deposed was Egelnoth, Abbot of Glastonbury, who was succeeded by Thurstan, a monk of Caen. The new abbot governed his monks tyrannically, enforcing the observance of the Benedictine rule with severity. He also required them to abandon

the Gregorian way of singing to which they had been accustomed, and to adopt the latest improvements introduced from the model abbey of Caen. It is probable that he also desired to make some modifications in the substance of the offices. This the monks refused to admit. The abbot ordered his men-at-arms into the church to coerce them : the monks snatched up benches and candlesticks, and stood upon their defence. Some of the soldiers were wounded, three of the monks were killed and eighteen wounded. In the end they were all brought to trial before the king, who sent Thurstan back to Normandy, and removed the monks from their house. This scandal set Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, upon a revision of the Church offices of his diocese, and he effected it with such success that the office of Precentor of the province of Canterbury was attached to his see in after years. The "Use of Sarum," thus approved by the bishops of the southern dioceses, was generally adopted in the south of England, and in some other places in the country, though other local Uses still continued, the chief of which were the Use of York, Hereford, and Bangor.

Thurstan's dragooning the monks of Glastonbury was an extreme example, but by no means a solitary one, of the peremptory conduct of the Normans. Lanfranc himself converted his chapter of secular clerks at Canterbury into a community of Benedictines. It was done, indeed, in legal form by a vote of the chapter ; the dean and the majority of the canons yielding to the archbishop's wishes and retaining their places ; but the minority, who refused to become monks, were expelled by force.

The changes, then, which the Norman Conquest brought to the English Church may be briefly summed up thus : it brought the Church of England under the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see, but it still firmly

maintained the independence and authority of the Crown; it brought the Church of England within the influence of the currents of thought which were moving through the continental Churches, and laid her open to the introduction of doctrinal novelties. On the other hand, the superior learning and zeal of the Norman bishops and clergy, abbots and monks, who were introduced into the Church, the erection of noble cathedrals, abbeys, and churches, the introduction of practical improvements of various kinds, elevated the tone of the Church, and amounted to a revival of religion.

CHAPTER XII

THE QUARREL OF INVESTITURE

THE next king, William Rufus, and the next archbishop, Anselm, bring us to the next of our turning points, the quarrel of investiture, the real point at issue being who should appoint the bishops. The quarrel on this question here in England, between Kings Rufus and Henry on one side, and Archbishop Anselm on the other, was only a branch of a great contest which distracted all Europe for half-a-century, in which the Emperor and the Pope were the chief combatants. The compromise by which our quarrel was terminated afforded a precedent for the solution of the greater and wider dispute. To a satisfactory understanding of the question, a glance at the whole history of which it formed an episode is necessary.

We have already stated that one of the great corruptions of the Church in the 10th and 11th centuries, and one which led to a hundred other abuses, was that kings bestowed the episcopal sees on improper persons. One of the reforms at which Hildebrand aimed was to obtain for the Head of the Church a control over the appointment of bishops. This he sought to effect by denying to the sovereigns, and claiming for the Pope, *the right of investiture.*

According to the primitive custom of the Church, a bishop was elected to a vacant see by the clergy and people of the diocese. Usually the clergy took the

leading part in the selection, but the consent of the laity to their selection was also necessary. Lastly, the metropolitan and the other bishops of the province, having the power to refuse to consecrate, possessed indirectly a veto on the election. It does not appear that the early Christian emperors interfered with the freedom of choice any further than to make their own confirmation necessary in the great patriarchal sees, such as Rome and Constantinople. The Gothic and Lombard kings of Italy followed the same line of conduct. In the French monarchy a more extensive authority was assumed by the sovereign, who generally interfered in the choice either by direct nomination or by recommendatory letters to the electors.

But independently of this ancient prerogative of Christian sovereigns in the election of bishops in their kingdoms, the temporalities which attached to the sees gave the sovereigns an indirect but extensive power of controlling episcopal appointments. The bishop was invested with great estates, political functions and legal jurisdiction. The sovereign might fairly claim some right to refuse these to a man in whom he had not confidence, and without them a bishop practically could not fulfil the duties of his office. Charlemagne is said to have introduced the practice of treating these spiritual offices in the same way as the temporal offices of the empire, by requiring an oath of fealty from the tenant, and investing him by the presentation of the episcopal ring and the pastoral staff as symbols of his office. To this custom of investiture Gregory VII. took exception. The ring and staff, the Papal advocates argued, were the symbols of the spiritual authority, which kings and emperors could not bestow. Even if a less objectionable symbol were chosen for investiture, which should clearly typify the conveyance of the temporalities only, still the

power of the sovereign over the temporalities gave him virtually power to control the free election by the Church of its bishops; and though the temporalities might rightly be subject to the king's pleasure, yet they had been inseparably annexed to the spiritual office, and it was just that the spiritual office should carry with it these accessories. Moreover, it was known to all men that the practical result of lay nomination had been to fill the sees with improper persons, and to corrupt the Church with simony. The contest about investiture begun by Gregory VII. was continued by his successors, Urban II., Paschal II., and Calixtus II., against the contemporary emperors, Henry IV. and Henry V. It lasted fifty-six years, and occasioned sixty battles and the loss of countless lives. At length both parties grew weary of the strife, and terminated it by a compromise in the Council of Worms, A.D. 1122, between the Emperor Henry V. and Pope Calixtus II. By this treaty it was settled that all elections of bishops should be freely conducted according to the laws of the Church, but under the supervision of the Emperor; that the right of spiritual investiture by ring and staff should belong to the Pope, and that of enfeoffment into the temporalities by the sceptre to the Emperor. This agreement was confirmed by the first Lateran Council, A.D. 1123.

William and Lanfranc had, as we have seen, placed the Church of England under the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see, but they had made a firm stand against the pretensions of the Pope to a temporal authority, and in both their concession and their resistance the king and the archbishop acted together. But the next archbishop, Anselm, was an ultramontane, while the sons of the Conqueror, William and Henry, maintained the prerogative as firmly as their great father

had done; and the next stage of our history shows us a quarrel between the sovereign and the archbishop, the cause of which is the firmness of the kings in maintaining their own prerogative, against the endeavours of the archbishop to cede it to Rome.

When Lanfranc died, the eyes of the Church and nation turned to Anselm, Abbot of Bec, as the fittest man to succeed him. Anselm, born in 1033 of noble parents, at Aosta, in Piedmont, was a pupil of Lanfranc's at Bec, assisted him in his teaching, and became a monk at 27 years of age. When Lanfranc was moved to Caen, Anselm succeeded him as Prior of Bec; and when the Abbot Herluin died, Anselm was unanimously elected abbot. Holy and gentle, of great learning, a profound metaphysician, an eloquent writer and speaker, he was more famous than Lanfranc, and perhaps the most famous scholar of his day; and he was not merely the great scholar of a particular generation, his fame still endures as the founder or forerunner of the scholastic theology of the Middle Ages. Some of his writings are still read by the theologian, and some are still current in books of popular devotion. Under him the fame of the school of Bec rose higher even than under Lanfranc. But he had not Lanfranc's political skill.

William Rufus had not his father's regard for the Church, and when bishoprics and abbeys fell vacant he kept them so for years, appropriating their revenues to his own uses. Thus after Lanfranc's death he kept the archiepiscopal see vacant four years, and it was only a sickness, which terrified him with the prospect of death, which induced him at length to nominate Anselm to the see. But there sprang up at once a disagreement between them. It was the custom of the bishops to make a present to the king on their nomination; Anselm justly

disapproving the custom, which bore the appearance of a simoniacal transaction, offered so small a present that the king contemptuously refused it, and Anselm bestowed it in alms upon the poor. Next Anselm asked leave to go and receive his pall from the Pope. Now this was during the existence of a schism, when there were two Popes—Urban II., the successor of Gregory VII., who was ultimately regarded as the rightful Pope, and Clement, the anti-Pope set up by the German emperor. Urban occupied the Lateran, while Clement maintained himself in the castle of St. Angelo. "Which Pope?" asked the king. "Urban," at once replied the archbishop. "But I have not acknowledged him," retorted the king, and he accused the archbishop of a violation of his oath of fealty. It was quite true that William I. and Lanfranc had reserved to the Crown the right of deciding between rival pretenders to the Papacy; but since Anselm, as Abbot of Bec, had already, in common with the Church of Normandy, recognized Gregory and his successor, he could hardly be expected now to retract and declare himself ready to recognize the anti-Pope if the king should so decide. The subject was allowed to drop, and meantime the king secretly sent two chaplains to Rome. Probably he had made up his mind which Pope to recognize, but desired to take a politic advantage of Urban's difficulties to obtain certain concessions from him as the price of his recognition. One of the concessions appears to have been on the subject of investiture. He aimed at obtaining for himself the right of conferring the badge of office on his archbishop. This will explain why the king was enraged that the archbishop took upon himself to recognize Urban, and that he desired to accede to the Papal demand that an archbishop should go in person to receive the pall at Rome. The king's

chaplains succeeded in their mission: they returned accompanied by a legate from Urban, bringing the pall with him. The legate passed through Canterbury without holding any communication with the archbishop; and the king caused Urban to be proclaimed as Pope without consultation with him. But the legate compromised the question of the pall: Anselm was not required to go to receive the pall at the hand of the Pope, nor did the legate give it him in the Pope's name. Neither, on the other hand, did the legate hand it over to the king that he might confer it; he laid it on the altar of the cathedral, and Anselm took it thence.

Still the king and the archbishop quarrelled, and the archbishop asked leave to go to Rome and seek counsel of the Pope. This the king was determined not to permit, and it was unlawful for the archbishop to go without his permission. At last Anselm declared his resolve to go without permission, and William threatened if he did to seize the archbishopric and never allow him to return. Anselm went in October, 1097, and by so doing put himself in the wrong, and the king fulfilled his threat.

When William Rufus died in 1100, Anselm set out on his return to England. Messengers from Henry met him, bearing the king's apologies for not having waited to be crowned by him, and urging his immediate return. The king received him with all honour, and proposed to re-invest him in his forfeited estates; whereupon a new difficulty arose. Anselm refused to do homage or receive his archbishopric at the hands of the king. Gregory VII., in the Lateran Council of 1080, had declared that a bishop receiving investiture of a layman should not be reckoned as a prelate. The question which arose was a new one in England. Hitherto, all bishops and abbots

—including Anselm—had been invested by the king with the symbols of the staff and ring. Not only the king and barons but also the bishops and clergy were opposed to Anselm. They declared themselves ready to pronounce sentence of banishment again on the archbishop, and to break off all intercourse with Rome, rather than submit to this unprecedented invasion of the customs of the Church and kingdom. Hereupon began a new contest between the archbishop and the king, but it was conducted in a very different spirit from that between Anselm and William Rufus. Anselm was as impracticable and persistent as ever; but Henry kept his temper, and behaved with great kindness and forbearance, treating Anselm's conscientious scruples with respect and doing his best to find some way of satisfying them without yielding the matter in dispute. First he suggested that an embassy should be sent to Rome, not—the king was careful to guard himself—that the king sought any concession from the Pope, but that perhaps the Pope might find some way to satisfy the archbishop's conscience, and enable him to conform to the law of England. Of his sovereignty over all persons in his dominions he declared firmly that no one should divest him. Meantime he allowed the archbishop to enjoy the revenues and discharge the duties of the see. The ambassadors returned from Rome bringing word that the Pope refused to permit the archbishop to receive investiture from the king. Thereupon the king gave Anselm the alternative to take the oath of allegiance and receive investiture according to the law of England, or to quit the kingdom. Anselm pleaded the canon of the Roman Council, which forbade him. The king replied, "What have I to do with a Roman canon? I

will never renounce a right which I have inherited, and no one shall remain in my kingdom who does not do homage to me as his suzerain." The bishops generally supported the king, and maintained the customs of the English Church. It was agreed to send another embassy to Rome. The Archbishop of York, the Bishops of Norwich and Lichfield, men who sided with the king on the question, were sent with a letter, in which the king declared that "so long as he lived he would, God helping him, never permit the rights and privileges of the kingdom of England to be diminished; and even if he should be inclined to yield, which God forbid, his nobles would not tolerate it. He hoped that the Pope would therefore, on reconsideration, not drive him to the extreme measure of renouncing all intercourse with the see of Rome." The father brought the Church of England under subjection to the see of Rome, and the son already talked of re-asserting its independence. The reader will find this right to resume its independence asserted over and over again by the kings and people of England until at last the right was exercised by Henry VIII., with the concurrence of the Church and Parliament.

The Pope sent a public document in reply, in which he upheld the decision against lay investiture; but the ambassadors brought a verbal message to the effect that if the king and the bishops acted according to the law of England they would not be troubled by the Court of Rome. Anselm refused to believe in the verbal message, and at the king's suggestion he sent messengers to Rome to inquire. The Pope by these messengers confirmed the formal document, and repudiated the private understanding. Next it was suggested that Anselm should go in person to Rome and consult the Pope.

The Pope temporized as long as he could, and when obliged to give a decision he acted as before; he supported Anselm publicly, but privately told the king that the question might remain open. As Anselm was returning to England, the king's ambassador informed him that unless he was prepared to submit to the king he was desired not to return. Anselm accordingly remained on the Continent. The king seized the archbishopric. Anselm was about to issue sentence of excommunication against him; when the king, then in Normandy, had an interview with him, and offered a compromise—that the bishops should do homage and take the oath of fealty to the king, but should not receive investiture by the ring and crosier. Anselm again, at the king's suggestion, sought the counsel of the Pope, and the Pope agreed to this compromise, the king surrendering the right to nominate bishops, and promising to give the chapters a *congé d'élire*—permission to elect. A council held in London in 1107 ratified this arrangement, reducing it to the following terms—(1) That for the future no one should be invested by the king or any lay hand in any bishopric or abbey by the delivery of a pastoral staff or a ring; (2) That no one elected to a prelacy should be denied consecration on account of the homage he does the king.

The substantial victory remained with the king, for at first by his influence on the chapters, and before long by a letter missive which accompanied the *congé d'élire*, he retained the actual nomination.

This continues to be the mode in which bishops are appointed in the Church of England. When a see is vacant, the sovereign sends to the chapter a document

called a *congé d'élire*—a licence to elect a new bishop. This election to a vacant see is in theory vested in the chapter of the cathedral, who may be supposed to represent the clergy of the diocese. But in fact the chapter have no voice or influence in the matter; for together with the *congé d'élire* is sent another document—a letter missive—in which is named the person whom the sovereign desires the chapter to elect. There is a further step called the confirmation, in which the name of the bishop elect is proclaimed in the face of the public (at Bow Church, London), and the people are invited to state any valid objection which may exist to the appointment. In the case of Bishop Hampden, the dean of Hereford and a minority of the chapter refused to elect the person named in the letters patent, but the opposition at this stage failed. Again, at the confirmation, objections were tendered by a proctor on behalf of the laity, but the presiding officer ruled that the Act of 25 Henry VIII. required the archbishop to confirm, and that objections could not be legally entertained. Therefore, in fact, as the election is overridden by the letter missive, so the confirmation is by the statute; and the Church's rights in the appointment of her chief ministers are controlled by the State. Finally, the Crown issues a mandate to the archbishop and certain other bishops to consecrate.

The old forms, kept up at every appointment of a bishop through all these centuries, are the Church's assertion of the right way of appointment, and they still remain in use, ready to have new vitality put into them, and capable, without any violent constitutional change, of giving the clergy of the diocese their right of election, the laity their right of objection, and the Crown the influence in the appointment which seems to be its

due so long as the bishops exercise legal jurisdiction in their courts, and sit in the Upper House of Parliament; while the bishops of the province still retain their ancient power of veto by refusing to consecrate an unfit person.

CHAPTER XIII

THE CONSTITUTIONS OF CLARENDON

HENRY OF ANJOU, by his inheritance of Normandy and Anjou and his marriage with the heiress of Aquitaine, was the most powerful sovereign who had yet reigned in England; and was not less able than any of his predecessors. He found England in great disorder after the civil war and anarchy of the previous twenty years. In Stephen's reign every petty baron had built himself a castle, waged war on his neighbours, ruled his own estates, and made himself almost an independent king; while the king was left little more than a great baron, ruling his own estates, and possessing certain feudal claims upon the rest of the baronage. Henry set himself to work, with a statesmanlike plan, great ability, and wonderful energy, to organize this aggregation of petty tyrannies into an orderly kingdom. His first step was to reduce the power of the barons. He compelled the dismantling of all castles which had been illegally erected without royal licence. He excused the nobles from serving under his banner in his foreign wars, requiring payment of a sum of money—*scutage*—instead; and with the revenues so raised he engaged mercenary soldiers to fight his battles abroad; at the same time he re-organized the ancient popular force of the fyrd or militia to secure order at home. William I. had organized a government, consisting of a Justiciar, who was the king's minister, under whom the king's clerks or chaplains formed a body of

secretaries, the chief of whom was called the Chancellor. Henry still further organized the legal department of the government, and established the system of judges of assize and justices in eyre. His aim was to reduce the hereditary jurisdiction of the nobles within the smallest possible limits; to obtain a pure and effectual system of royal law and justice over the whole kingdom; and to make all men equal before the law. In his measures with the barons he was successful. But there was another body in the kingdom with special privileges, to which he next turned his attention.

As a consequence of the division of jurisdictions established by William I. (see p. 98), the whole body of the clergy were exempt from the common law, and had a system of courts of their own. If an ecclesiastic committed a crime, he could not be tried and punished by the king's justices, but must be taken before the Ecclesiastical Court; all who were in any clerical office could claim the privilege. In those days learning was so entirely limited to the clergy, that it was enough for a man to be able to read Latin to establish the presumption that he was a clerk; and it is only in very late times that the last example occurred of a criminal claiming the obsolete but unrepealed "privilege of clergy," and escaping thereby the punishment of his crime. The king desired to reduce the power of these ecclesiastical courts, as he had of the ancient feudal jurisdictions, and to make the clergy, like the laity, subject to the general law of the land.

But the clergy formed a very powerful body of men. The archbishop ruled great estates, and was one of the most powerful of subjects; the bishops and great abbots were powerful barons; the clergy formed a great organization, extending over the whole country, exercising a

vast influence. The Church was a popular institution. From the days of the Conquest it had interposed between the tyranny of the nobles and the people. Throughout the Middle Ages the Church was on the side of the people; it set itself against the virtual slavery of serfage; it taught the equality of Saxon and Norman, rich and poor, in the sight of God. It acted upon its liberal theories, and formed the great channel by which a man could raise himself by his merit; the village lad, taught Latin by the village priest, and sent to the school of the monastery, might rise to the highest wealth and rank. At the time of which we speak, the son of a London merchant was about to be made Archbishop of Canterbury, and another Englishman, Nicholas Breakspear, was about to mount the Papal throne. Thanks to its power, to the influence it had with the people, and to the moral support it was sure to receive from the whole Papal organization, the Church was an *imperium in imperio*, which made its chief, the archbishop, far more powerful than any one except the king; and when we call to mind also the reserve of spiritual weapons—excommunication and interdict—in store for those who should assail the rights of the Church, it is evident that it needed great caution, even in so powerful and able a sovereign as Henry, to carry out the designs which he entertained.

But he proposed to effect his plan by placing at the head of the Church a man who agreed with him in his views, and who would aid, instead of opposing him, in reducing the Church into subjection to the law of the land. The man he had in view was Thomas Becket, his chancellor. There is a romantic story about the birth of Becket which we give as one of the legends which gradually gathered about the story of the most popular of the English mediæval saints. Gilbert Becket, the

legend says, went, like many of his countrymen in those days, on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. There he and his servant were taken captive by the Saracens, and became slaves to an Emir. The Emir's daughter fell in love with Gilbert, and offered to release him if he would carry her with him as his wife; but Gilbert escaped without her assistance, and left her behind. Some months after, the citizens of London saw a maiden in an Eastern dress wandering through the streets, and crying, "Gilbert! Gilbert!" The shipmen who had brought her said that she had found her way to London by a similar repetition of the word "London!" and that these were all the words of English she could speak. At length she wandered through Southwark, and Gilbert Becket, attracted by the crowd which followed her, came to the window and recognized the Emir's daughter, who thus uttered her plaintive appeal to him. The Bishop of London, and other prelates who were with him when Gilbert asked his counsel, advised that she should be baptized, and that he should marry her.

The parentage and early life of Becket are well known. His father, Gilbert Becket, was a Norman, a merchant in Cheapside, his mother's name was Roesia, or Matilda; he received a good education at the house of the canons regular at Merton, and finished his education at Paris. Then he spent some years in the household of Richer de Aquila, at Pevensey Castle. When he was twenty-one, his father failed in business, and Thomas returned to London, and entered as a clerk into the office of a relative, who was the clerk to the Sheriffs of London. After three years of this apprenticeship to business, he was made known to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who took the promising young man into his household; he was ordained deacon, and provided for with several

benefices; the archbishop recommended him to the young king, who took him as his chancellor and one of his most trusted ministers, and gave him the dignity and emoluments of Archdeacon of Canterbury—the highest dignity in the Church next to that of the bishops. The chancellor was only thirty-eight years old, and was not only an able statesman, but also a most attractive companion; handsome in person, cultivated in mind, gay and cheerful in disposition, fond of field sports and eminently skilful in them, and magnificent in his tastes; the young king, a little over twenty, became much attached to him, and treated him with great familiarity.

The chronicler says that the chancellor was famous for the magnificence of his household and his profuse and costly hospitality. Earls and barons sat daily at the high table on his dais, and knights and gentlemen crowded the long tables of his hall, so that it was necessary to spread clean rushes every day on the floor for those to sit on who could find no room at the tables, that they might not soil their robes. Many of the sons of the nobility, according to the custom of the times, were placed as pages in his household:—the king himself sent his son to him as his pupil. Gold and silver dishes decked the table, the most costly viands and choicest wines were provided. The young king would sometimes ride into the hall in the midst of the meal, throw himself off his horse, leap over the high table, and sit down beside the chancellor, and join in the festivity. His biographers say that the gay chancellor was a man of pure life, and that amidst all this magnificence he fed on the plainest fare, and wore sackcloth under his costly robes; was liberal in alms, and the protector of the poor.

When Henry went to war with France, the chancellor brought to his aid 700 knights of his own household, and

1200 more in his pay, attended by 4000 foot; he himself in armour commanded them. When peace was made, the chancellor was sent as ambassador to conclude the treaty. He was attended by 200 men on horseback and a magnificent train, who went through France in procession, singing from time to time as they went, so so that all beholders said, "If such was the chancellor, what must be the king!" . . . One of the conditions of the treaty was the betrothal of the French king's daughter, who was seven years old, to the little Prince Henry, and she, as well as the prince, was committed to Becket's care.

This was the man whom the king, on the death of Theobald, proposed to make archbishop, in the expectation that he would aid in carrying out his plans for subjecting the clergy to the king's justice. Becket said words, when the king spoke of it, which might have warned him: "If you do as you say, my lord, you will soon hate me as much as you love me now; for you assume an authority in Church affairs to which I shall not consent; and there will be plenty of persons to stir up strife between us."

One of the chief abuses by the English kings of their episcopal patronage was using it to remunerate the great officials of their government. We have already seen that most of the men who entered into the civil service of the State were nominally clergymen, and thus were legally capable of holding Church benefices; and in the absence of any other mode of remunerating them for their services to the State, they were rewarded with benefices, whose spiritual duties they performed chiefly by proxy. Secretaries of State, and ambassadors and judges, were salaried by making them bishops, and probably Henry expected that Becket when promoted to Canterbury would continue to be more of a statesman than a bishop.

Hitherto Becket was only a deacon. On Whitsun-day, 1162, he was ordained priest, and on Trinity Sunday bishop. His secretary went to Rome to fetch the pall, which was laid on the altar of Canterbury, whence the archbishop took it. With his consecration as priest and bishop, Becket broke with his former life, and became another man. He resigned the chancellorship, assumed a more ascetic manner of life, and seemed to seek only to fulfil the duties of a good bishop.

The king had been on the Continent at the time of the archbishop's consecration. He returned in the following year, and speedily set about the prosecution of his plans. A council was summoned at Westminster, and the king's proposal was laid before it: that when a clerk should be proved guilty of a crime he should be deprived of his orders, and handed over to the king's officers to receive punishment as a layman. The proposal seems just to us. It was part of a great and wise plan for the organization of a sound system of judicature throughout the kingdom. The king was right in endeavouring to effect it—politic in seeking to effect it through Becket, the confidant of his plans, and hitherto one of his ablest agents in carrying them out. Our modern sympathies are with the king. But if we want to understand the subject, we must throw ourselves back to the 12th century, and see it as it presented itself to men's minds then. When at the Conquest the old Saxon courts of justice were remodelled and the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdictions were divided, the clergy had obtained the privilege of being tried in their own courts. In the feudal times, when every petty lord had his rights of judicature, to be able to claim benefit of clergy was a protection from provincial tyranny, which no cleric was likely to be willing to give up. There are foreign coun-

tries at this day where justice is so imperfectly administered that Englishmen resident there have justly secured for themselves the privilege of being tried by their own consular authorities; in an English dependency even (India) Englishmen will not trust themselves to the imperfect justice of the native courts. True, the king desired to establish a system of equal justice throughout the kingdom, and sought only that clerics as well as laymen should be subject to the same system of law. But the experiment of the king's justice had still to be tried. Between subject and subject, lay or clerical, it might be wisely and impartially administered; but with the mediæval notions of law and habits of injustice, would it have been wise in the clergy to surrender their privileges and put themselves at the mercy of the Crown? If we look to much later times, when the liberty of the subject was better understood, and public opinion was a considerable check upon the power of the sovereign, we shall see that, with judges removable at the king's pleasure, the subject had a very small chance in any case in which the interests or the passions of the sovereign were concerned.

To take the people from under the feudal nobles and place them under the king's justices was no doubt an advantage to the people, but to take the clergy from under their own courts and put them under the king's courts would have been a disadvantage to the clergy. However far-sighted and statesmanlike the king's plans might be, to make all subjects, noble and simple, clerical and lay, equal before the law, we must not be surprised if the clergy declined to sacrifice themselves to the symmetry of a system.

When the king's proposal was laid before the council at Westminster, the bishops were inclined to take the king's view of the matter, but the archbishop thought it

the duty of his office to maintain the privileges of the clergy, and the arguments of the archbishop brought the bishops with one exception to his side. The king was probably unprepared to find the archbishop his opponent, and he was greatly enraged.

The archbishop wrote to the Pope for counsel, but the king also sent ambassadors and used great influence at Rome, and the Papal court treated Becket as it had treated Anselm: temporized, gave ambiguous replies, said enough to encourage the archbishop to fight the battle, and did not say enough to cause a breach with the king; declared that what the king required was wrong, and recommended the bishop to keep friendly with him.

Becket seems to have tried to follow this temporizing policy. He agreed to consent to the laws proposed by the king without introducing the saving clause—"saving the privileges of his order"—with which he had hitherto guarded and practically invalidated his consent. The king required that this should be done in legal form by the Church assembled in council under the presidency of the archbishop; and a council was convoked at Clarendon in Wiltshire for the purpose. There the proposed laws (or Constitutions, as the acts of a council were called) were read, and Becket, having verbally assented to them, was required to execute them legally by affixing his archiepiscopal seal to them, whereupon he declared with much emotion that he would never consent to set his seal to them, and great confusion ensued. The king left the room in anger, and, while the bishops continued in consultation, sent them angry and threatening messages. But the council broke up without anything being done, and the king's plans were thwarted.

Becket condemned himself to penance for his temporary yielding to the king's demands. The king, on the other hand, began to persecute him under the forms of law. He charged him with a failure of justice, which he alleged had taken place in the archbishop's own court; and when the archbishop appeared by proxy instead of in person to answer the charge, he condemned him to forfeiture of his whole personal property. Then he accused him of malversation in his office of chancellor, the king's avowed object being to drive him to submission or resignation. When the sentence was about to be pronounced, the archbishop pleaded that no one had a right to call him to account for what he had done as chancellor, since on his appointment to the archbishopric the king had legally released him from all former claims. He appealed from the king to the Pope, and placed himself and his Church under the protection of the apostolic see. Then, fearing that his life was not safe, he fled to the Continent. Henry was tyrannical enough to plunder all his relations and adherents, and banish them the kingdom, to the number of 400. Becket remained in exile six years. Two interviews with the king during that time, held through the mediation of the King of France, were fruitless. At a third interview a reconciliation was effected, and in a friendly conversation, in which old feelings were for the time rekindled, Henry exclaimed, "Why will you not do as I wish? I would put all my affairs into your hands."

The archbishop returned to England, and was received with great demonstrations of joy by the people. But the archbishop had sent before him a sentence of excommunication on the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Salisbury, for usurping his own functions during his absence. The three bishops at once set out

to Normandy to lay their complaints before the king. "What would you have me do?" said Henry. "Your barons must advise you," answered one of the bishops, "but as long as Thomas lives you will never be at peace." "A curse on all the false varlets I have maintained," said the king, "who have left me so long subject to the insolence of a priest, without attempting to rid me of him!" Four of his knights who had heard the rash words set out for England. They hastened to Canterbury, calling on their way at Saltwood Castle, the residence of Randolf de Broc, one of the archbishop's bitterest personal enemies, and taking with them some of his retainers armed. The history of the archbishop's death is recorded at length by one of his own household, and gives us a vivid picture of the consternation and confusion of the monks and clerks, the calmness and dignity of the archbishop, the mixed violence and irresolution of the four knights, who found it difficult to slay in cold blood an unarmed man, unresisting, and he the archbishop, in his own cathedral. At length the knights began to fear that the people of Canterbury would hear of the archbishop's danger and come to the rescue. The archbishop had long made up his mind to martyrdom. He had been taunted with it five years before at Pontigny. When the knights first broke in upon him, he expressed his readiness to suffer; he would not flee; when he entered the church he would not suffer the doors to be secured; when he was struck he did not move hand or foot, but said, "In the name of Christ, and for the defence of the Church, I am ready to die." His monks accepted his death as a martyrdom, and laid out his body on the high altar. The news of the crime ran throughout Europe, and the archbishop was everywhere honoured as a saint and martyr who had laid down

his life in defence of the rights of the Church. Henry showed symptoms of sincere grief for the death of his old friend, and horror that his hasty words should have been the occasion of it. He sent an embassy to the Pope to excuse himself and entreat forgiveness. He obtained forgiveness on condition of giving up his plan to subject the Church to the law of the State, and maintaining 200 knights for three years in the Holy Land. Shortly came reports that miracles were wrought at the tomb of the martyr, and Pope Alexander canonized him. A beautiful chapel, built at the east end of the cathedral, contained his shrine, and Thomas of Canterbury became the most popular saint, and his shrine the greatest place of pilgrimage, among the English people. When Henry next came to England, in 1174, he rode from Southampton to Canterbury without resting, dismounted at the gate of the city, walked barefoot through the streets to the cathedral, and prostrated himself on the ground before the martyr's shrine. In the chapter-house he caused each of the monks to strike him with the discipline, and afterwards he spent the whole night in the church beside the tomb. The murderers were avoided by every one, and were sent to Rome to put themselves at the Pope's disposal. He ordered them to go on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. A doubtful legend says that one died on the road, and that the others died within three years, and were buried before the door of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

Statutes of Edward III. and Henry VII. at length restricted the privilege of clergy, but it was the Reformation statutes of the 16th century which finally made clerical offenders liable to the same punishments as others not in holy orders.

CHAPTER XIV

THE POPE'S VASSAL

When Hubert Walter, the Archbishop of Canterbury and Grand Justiciary, died at Canterbury on the 13th of July, 1205, a party among the monks, without waiting for King John's *congé d'élire* and letter of nomination, assembled in the chapter-house the same night and elected Reginald, their sub-prior, conducted him into the cathedral and installed him in the archiepiscopal throne, and then sent him off to Rome to obtain the Pope's confirmation of his election, binding him to secrecy till the Pope's support had been secured. The king issued his *congé d'élire* to the chapter in the usual way, and recommended to them John de Grey, Bishop of Norwich, who was one of the justiciaries of the kingdom. Meantime it became known that as soon as the sub-prior Reginald had reached the Continent he had given it out that he was the elect of Canterbury, and begun to assume the state of an archbishop. His supporters, being ashamed of his conduct, and alarmed for the consequences of their intrigue, abandoned him, and joined with the rest in electing the king's nominee. Twelve of the monks of Christ Church were sent to Rome with a handsome present to oppose the claims of Reginald, and bring back the pall for John de Grey. But in the election of Grey, an alleged right of the suffragan bishops of the province of Canterbury to be consulted, had been neglected, and they, too, sent an embassy to the Pope to guard their interests.

Innocent III. was Pope, one of the greatest of the successors of Gregory VII., and who carried highest the Hildebrandine claim to universal sovereignty. It was the policy of the Popes to seize every such opportunity as this for advancing their own claims. Accordingly the Pope declared Reginald's election irregular, as was manifestly the case; but then he declared John's election irregular also, because it had been made before the irregularity of the previous one had been decided by the competent tribunal, *i. e.* by the Pope. Then, both candidates being set aside, the Pope called upon the monks of Canterbury who were present in Rome to proceed to a new election, and nominated Stephen Langton to them to be elected. The case had been foreseen, and the ambassadors had received their instructions; they had been sworn to accept no one but the king's nominee. They pleaded their oath; from which the Pope forthwith absolved them. They pleaded that the right of election was in the cathedral chapter, not in them, and that the king's consent was necessary; whereupon the Pope threatened them with excommunication. Finally, with the exception of one bold man, who still refused to concur, they accepted the Pope's nomination. No doubt Stephen Langton was a fitter man for the Archbishopric of Canterbury than either Reginald, the indiscreet sub-prior, or John, the justiciary. An Englishman by birth and Prebendary of York, a man of piety, learning, and ability, he had lately been the head of the University of Paris, then the most famous school of theology in Europe, and at present was high in office in Rome, and had lately been nominated a cardinal. It was an excellent appointment. The Pope was a man of the highest character for piety, and sought to exercise the vast powers which he claimed in the interests of religion; he deprived himself of a personal friend and

valuable official in order to send to Canterbury the man who seemed best fitted for the important office; but it was an encroachment of the Pope on the rights of the chapter and of the king.

The king drove the monks of Canterbury out of the country for electing without his *congé d'élire;* wrote to the Pope insisting upon his confirmation of Grey's election; and declared that Langton should never set foot in England. John was so utterly bad as a man and as a king, that our sympathies are apt to go against him under all circumstances; but in the present case he was not without some show of right. The Pope virtually acknowledged that John had some ground of complaint; and went so far as to press the king to accept Langton, with a promise that the present transaction should not be drawn into a precedent. John refused to yield; the Pope, equally resolved not to recede, proceeded to the extreme step of putting the kingdom under an interdict.

We have before had occasion to speak of the Pope's spiritual weapons of excommunication and interdict; this is the place to explain them. The excommunication of an individual cut him off from the visible Church; he was shunned by all Christian people; he might not enter a church; he must live without its sacraments, and be buried like a dog; moreover, it carried with it civil disabilities; he was without the pale of the law; the civil power would not defend him from spoliation or personal injury, or revenge his death. The sentence of interdict was passed against a whole nation. Its effect was to deprive the whole people of the offices of religion. The churches were closed, the new-born might be baptized, and the last sacraments given to the dying, but all public services were suspended; and the people were required to observe the penitential mortifications of Lent, for the land

lay under the ban of the Church. Innocent had already, eight years before, used the terrible weapon with effect against Philip Augustus, one of the ablest of the kings of France, and compelled him by means of it to separate himself from a second wife and receive again the wife whom he had unlawfully put away.

The Bishops of London, Ely, and Worcester received a commission from Innocent to pronounce the interdict. They made one last attempt to move the king; but he threatened them, with rage, that if any of the bishops dared to publish the sentence he would banish them and seize their property, and if any Roman priest dared come into the kingdom to publish it he would put out his eyes. At midnight, however, towards the end of Lent, 1208, the three bishops pronounced the sentence and fled. The rest of the bishops left the kingdom also, except the Bishop of Winchester and John de Grey, the Bishop of Norwich, who disregarded the sentence, as did individual parishes in other dioceses. Grey, the justiciary, was shortly sent to govern Ireland, and the Bishop of Winchester was the only bishop remaining in England. The king was greatly enraged with the clergy; he persecuted the relations of the bishops, seized the property of the bishops and clergy, confined the monks to their cloisters, and threatened to drive out of the kingdom the clergy who obeyed the interdict. Ultimately he allowed the clergy a scanty maintenance out of their estates and benefices, while he converted the rest to his own use. Month after month passed away leaving the kingdom in this condition, while John pursued his pleasures and provoked his nobles by acts of lawless tyranny. The Roman court, however, had other weapons in its armoury, and seeing that the interdict failed to reduce the king to obedience, it proceeded to bring forward its reserves. In 1209, the

sentence of excommunication was uttered against the king. The effects of it appeared at once. For example, Geoffrey, Archdeacon of Norwich, one of the judges of the Court of Exchequer, heard, while sitting on the bench, that the sentence had been pronounced, and at once rose from his seat and left the court with some expression about the danger of serving an excommunicated king. John had him thrown into prison and a leaden cope put over his head, and by this and other severe usage put an end to his life.

The king now sought a conference with the archbishop at Dover, and offered to submit to the Pope, to acknowledge Langton as primate, to restore the exiled clergy, and to pay a limited sum as compensation for their confiscated rents. But Langton demanded restitution in full; and the conference was broken off. The sentence of deposition followed. The king's subjects were absolved from their allegiance, and the Pope granted the forfeited kingdom to Philip of France, and bade him raise an army and take possession of it. John on his side called out the military force of the kingdom, and assembled a considerable body of men at Dover to oppose the threatened invasion. But the tyrant dared not trust his own subjects, and he secretly sent the Abbot of Beaulieu to Pandulph, the legate whom the Pope had sent as his representative with the French invading force, to offer terms of submission. Pandulph sent back two knights of the Temple to John, and to them he promised an entire submission. Pandulph then came over in person. The king signed a charter in which he said that, not constrained by fear, but of his own free will, and with the common advice and consent of his barons, he had for the remission of his sins, and those of his family, resigned England and Ireland to God, St. Peter, and St. Paul, and to Pope Innocent

and his successors in the apostolic chair. He agreed to hold these dominions as feudatory of the Church of Rome by the annual payment of a thousand marks. And he agreed that if he or his successors should revoke or infringe this charter they should forfeit all right to their dominions. John took before Pandulph the oath of fealty, the same in form which vassals customarily took to their lords; and a few months later he did homage to the Cardinal of Tusculum. In the Temple Church at Ewell, near Dover, on the eve of the Ascension, 1213, the legate sat enthroned, King John knelt before him, laid his crown at his feet, put his hands between those of the legate, and took the customary oath of fealty to the Pope as to his superior lord.

The exiled prelates returned in triumph with Langton at their head. The king went forth to meet them, threw himself on the ground before them, and entreated them to have compassion on himself and on the kingdom. The cardinal gave him absolution, and the Church recalled its anathemas.

It is not within the scope of our plan to detail how the archbishop, thus illegally forced upon the kingdom, at once identified himself with its interests, put himself at the head of a confederacy of the barons to control the king's abuses of his power; disregarded the displeasure of the Pope, who would have protected his vassal; and at Runnymede extorted from the king the great charter which still forms the basis of the liberties of Englishmen. The simple explanation of this unexpected turn of affairs is that Stephen Langton was an Englishman, and that the Church of England was always throughout the Middle Ages found on the side of freedom.

When John died in the midst of the war with the

rebel barons, the guardians of the young King Henry III. found it necessary that he should renew the oath of fealty to the Pope in order to obtain his support. The Pope was regarded as the feudal superior of England throughout this reign, and used with little restraint the extraordinary power thus acquired over the English Church. His legates frequently visited the kingdom, made progresses, were sumptuously entertained, and extorted money from the bishops and clergy and abbots and convents. The unwise, feeble king, instead of protecting his clergy, made common cause with the Pope and accepted a share of his extortions.

At this period the Popes were attempting to take the whole patronage of the Church into their own hands, and England throughout the reign of Henry III. especially lay at their mercy. Adrian IV. had begun by requesting some bishops as a favour to confer the next benefice that should fall vacant on a particular clerk. Alexander III. used to solicit similar favours. These recommendatory letters were called *Mandates*, and it was difficult for a bishop to refuse to comply with them. Sometimes the Popes gave away next presentations to particular livings before they were vacant, by letters of what was called *Provision*. Innocent III. continued the custom of giving mandates. Gregory IX. and Innocent IV. used the patronage of England almost as if it were their own, and Italians were introduced into the best benefices in England. Two or three facts will illustrate the condition of things. Gregory IX., in 1240, sent orders to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of Lincoln and Salisbury, to appoint no one to a benefice until 300 Italians had been provided for. Three Italians walked one day into York Cathedral and asked which was the Dean's stall; then two of them, acting under the Pope's

authority, installed the third as dean; when the archbishop refused to admit the appointment he was excommunicated and an interdict was laid on the see. One Italian held 700 benefices. A remonstrance was presented in the name of the nation before the Council of Lyons, in which it was asserted that the court of Rome drew from England in the middle of the 13th century 60 or 70,000 marks every year, a sum far exceeding the royal revenue. The people not only remonstrated, but in the face of Christendom showed the greatness of their exasperation by outward acts. Bands of rioters, organized, and headed, it was said, by men of position, used to seize the tithes of the foreign incumbents and distribute them among the poor.

CHAPTER XV

THE MONKS

THE orders of monks and friars occupied so prominent a place, and played so important a part, for several centuries, in the history of the Church of England, that it seems desirable to give an account of them; the more so as their history and character were at their dissolution very much misrepresented, and are still very generally misunderstood.

If we want really to estimate these institutions fairly, we must first try to enter into the spirit which gave rise to them. In the midst of the ordinary sort of religious people, there have always been some of a more earnest, enthusiastic spirit, who have aimed at living a more unworldly life, and in closer communion with God. In the Church of the old dispensation we find individual examples, as Elijah, John the Baptist, Anna the prophetess; and we find, moreover, institutions founded on this basis, as the Nazarites, the schools of the prophets, and the Essenes. Unworldliness of life, entire self-devotion to God, continual communion with Him—a life "hid with Christ in God"—are still more in accordance with the spirit of the Christian Church. Certain precepts of our Lord, taken in their literal sense, teach a high degree of asceticism; the lives of the Apostles are examples of it; the community of goods in the primitive Church of Jerusalem was a remarkable illustration of it; and while their first zeal lasted the most striking characteristic of

the Christians in the eyes of their Jewish and heathen neighbours must have been their asceticism. Among the Christians themselves it was held that there was a certain mode of holy living for those who lived in the world, engaged in its ordinary business, and not forbidden to enjoy its innocent pleasures; but that others might lawfully, and even laudably, withdraw from the ordinary pursuits of life in order to devote themselves to a life of more entire devotion. They believed that some were called—"had a vocation"—by God to the one and some to the other mode of life. They took Martha and Mary as the types of the two classes of Christians: Martha, laudably busied in the affairs of her household for the service of our Lord and His Apostles, is the type of the active Christian life; Mary, defended by our Lord from blame for leaving all the household cares to Martha, while she sat at Jesus' feet listening to His words, is the type of the contemplative Christian life.

It is in Egypt, in the 2nd century, that we first find these Christian ascetics forming an organized institution. Many, both men and women, had fled from the fierce, sensual, persecuting heathen world into the wilderness, to live a peaceful, contemplative religious life as hermits. The mountainous desert on the east of the Nile valley was their favourite resort. There they lived in little separate hermitages of rudely piled-up stones, or in caves scooped out of the mountain side, or in the rock-hewn cells of the ancient Egyptian tombs, cultivating a little garden, keeping a few goats, feeding on pulse, and herbs, and wild fruit, and milk, and water from the neighbouring spring. People were often attracted by the fame of the wisdom and sanctity of some hermit to come and settle in his neighbourhood for the advantage of his instruction and guidance in a holy life. In time this

arrangement became systematized ; a number of separate cells grouped round a common oratory contained a company of recluses, who agreed to certain rules and to the guidance of a chosen head ; an enclosure wall was generally built round this group of cells ; and the establishment was called a *Laura*. The transition from this arrangement of a group of anchorites occupying the anchorages of a Laura, under the oversight of a spiritual head, to that of a community living together in one building under the rule of an abbot, was natural and easy. The authorship of this community life is attributed to St. Anthony, who occupied a ruined castle in the Nile desert with a company of disciples in the former half of the 4th century. The first written code of laws for the regulation of the life of these communities was drawn up by Pachomius, a disciple of Anthony. St. Basil, afterwards Bishop of Cæsarea, who died A.D. 379, introduced this monastic system into Asia Minor, whence it spread over the East. He drew up a code of laws founded on those of Pachomius, which was the foundation of all succeeding monastic rules, and is still followed by the monasteries of the Greek Church. The Rule of St. Basil enjoins poverty, obedience, and chastity. The habit of the monks and nuns was, and still is universally in the Greek Church, a plain, coarse black robe, reaching down to the ankles, girt round the waist with a girdle of leather or cord, and a cowl to protect the head when needful ; the monks went barefoot, and shaved the hair in a crescent off the fore part of the head. Hilarion is reported to have introduced the institution into Syria, St. Augustine into Africa, St. Martin of Tours into France, and St. Patrick into Ireland, in the 5th century. Who introduced it into the British Church we do not know, but it was introduced here about the same

period, probably by way of France, and flourished greatly.

We have already had occasion to speak of the Celtic monasteries in chapter V., to which we refer the reader. In the British monasteries, the vows do not appear to have been perpetual, for in the legends of the British saints we constantly find that a monk quitted the cloister without scruple. We have seen in chapter VIII. that in the early phase of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the monastery was the great centre of Church life in each diocese, the seat of education, and the centre of missionary work, and the bishop in his proper place at the head of it. There are indications that the exigencies of our missionary work among the heathen may lead to our establishment among them in these days of somewhat similar institutions to these missionary communities to which we ourselves owe our Christianity.

In the year 529 A.D. St. Benedict, an Italian of noble birth and great reputation, introduced into his new monastery on Monte Cassino—a hill between Rome and Naples—a new monastic rule; and set such an example of monastic life as led to a reform of the system throughout Europe. To the three vows which lie at the foundation of all monastic rules, of obedience, poverty, and chastity, he added another, that of manual labour, for seven hours a day, not only as a means of self-support, but also as a duty to God and man. He also made the vows perpetual. His rule speedily became popular, and was adopted all over the continent of Europe; but the Celtic monasteries did not embrace the new rule.

Since Saxon England was converted, partly by Augustine and his monks, partly by the missionaries of Iona and Lindisfarne, it was natural that the monastic system should flourish in the Saxon Church. Bede tells us

that in his time it had spread very much among the nobility, as well as among persons of private condition. Several of the Saxon kings anticipated Charles V. in putting off the crown and entering into the quiet, contemplative life of the cloister to prepare for heaven. The Saxon monasteries, however, seem to have had no uniform rule, and under the one name of monastery were included establishments of very different character, some communities of ascetics under the rule of Benedict, others of secular priests living in community, others with very modified rules, which did not even prevent their inmates from marriage. About the middle of the 10th century King Edgar reformed the English monasteries, which had fallen into the hands of seculars, and compelled them all to adopt a strict monastic rule.

A century after, the Benedictine rule having in many places come to be very laxly observed, several new reformed orders sprang up out of its bosom. One of the most popular of these was the Cistercian; owing much of its reputation to the fame of the great St. Bernard, who joined it (in 1113 A.D.) soon after its establishment.

The Norman conquest of England took place at the time of this revival of learning and religious life in the monasteries. The Normans were among the foremost people in Europe in energy, intellectual cultivation, and religious zeal; and the nobles and gentlemen, in setting in order their newly-acquired possessions in England, not only rebuilt the cathedrals and many of the parish churches in the grand new style of architecture which had been introduced by the genius of the Norman architects, but they also built monasteries and introduced many communities of these newly-reformed orders of monks. It may be doubted whether, under the circum-

stances of the time, they could have done anything better calculated to promote the spread of learning, civilization, and religion among the people.

There is a good deal of popular misunderstanding about the way in which these religious houses were founded. People talk as if the monks went up and down the country and selected for themselves the most beautiful and fertile tract of land they could find; and the owner at once made them a present of it; and somebody built them a stately house and a magnificent church; and then they took possession, and settled down to a life of dignified and luxurious leisure. The facts are far otherwise. England in the 12th and 13th centuries was half covered with forest, and moor, and marsh. What was given to the founders of a monastery was generally a tract of such country as this. It was all they asked. The monks desired to settle in remote places; they gladly accepted the task of reclaiming the waste land. And to give a tract of unreclaimed land to people who would settle on it and bring it into cultivation, was not then a much greater sacrifice than it is now to allot a few acres of land to a family of emigrants to Canada, to induce them to settle there.

We have a contemporary account of the founding of the great abbey of Clairvaux by St. Bernard, which may serve as an example. "Twelve monks and their abbot," says his Life in the Acta Sanctorum, "representing our Lord and His Apostles, were assembled in the church. Stephen (the abbot of the mother house of Cîteaux) placed a cross in Bernard's hands, who solemnly, at the head of his small band, walked forth from Cîteaux. . . . Bernard struck away to the northward. For a distance of nearly seventy miles he kept his course till he arrived at La Ferté. About four miles beyond La Ferté was a

deep valley opening to the east. Thick umbrageous forests gave it a character of gloom and wildness; but a gushing stream of limpid water which ran through it was sufficient to redeem every disadvantage. In June, A.D. 1115, Bernard took up his abode in the Valley of Wormwood, as it was called, and began to look for means of shelter and sustenance against the approaching winter. The rude fabric which he and his monks raised with their own hands was long preserved by the pious veneration of the Cistercians. It consisted of a building covered by a single roof, under which chapel, dormitory, and refectory were all included. Neither stone nor wood hid the bare earth which served for floor. Windows scarcely wider than a man's hand admitted a feeble light. In this room the monks took their frugal meal of herbs and water. Immediately above the refectory was the sleeping apartment. It was reached by a ladder, and was in truth a sort of loft. Here were the monks' beds, which were peculiar. They were made in the form of boxes or bins, of wooden planks, long and wide enough for a man to lie down in.[1] A small space hewn out with an axe allowed room for the sleeper to get in or out. The inside was strewn with chaff or dried leaves, which, with the wood-work, seem to have been the only covering permitted. . . . The monks had thus got a house over their heads, but they had got very little else. Autumn and winter were approaching, and they had no store laid by. Their food during summer had been a compound of leaves intermixed with coarse grain. Beech-nuts and roots were to be their main support during the winter. And then to the privations of insufficient food was added the wearing out of their shoes

[1] Very similar beds are provided for the houseless vagrants of London in the Field Lane Refuge.

and clothes. Their necessities grew with the severity of the season, till at last even salt failed them, and presently Bernard heard murmurs, and the monks requested to be led back to Cîteaux. But a stranger gave them an alms of ten livres, and enabled them to supply their most pressing necessities."

So in the history of the foundation of the great abbey of Fountains, whose ruins and whose gardens now compose one of the most beautiful places in England. The history is abridged by Burton[1] from the narrative of Hugh, a monk of Kirkstall.[2]

The fame of the sanctity of the Cistercian monks at the neighbouring abbey of Rivaulx having extended to the Benedictine monastery of St. Mary at York, several of the monks became discontented with the relaxed rule observed there, and proposed to withdraw and found another community which should observe the new Cistercian rule. The abbot was opposed to their withdrawal from their proper house and rule; whereupon, A.D. 1132, Richard the Prior, who was one of the reforming party, called upon Thurstan, the Archbishop of York, to visit the abbey, and regulate what was amiss, and urged him also to aid those who desired to withdraw. On the day fixed for the visitation, the archbishop, attended by many clergy and a great retinue, went to the abbey; but the abbot had gathered a great number of monks to oppose him, who refused the archbishop admittance to the chapter-house, and an uproar ensued; whereupon the archbishop placed the abbey under interdict, and withdrew. He took away with him under his protection the prior and sub-prior and eleven monks,

[1] 'Monasticon Eboracense,' p. 141.

[2] In a MS. in the possession of the Royal Society, published *in extenso* by Dugdale in his 'Monasticon.'

who desired to withdraw from the abbey, and he entertained them in his own house for eleven weeks and five days.

At Christmas the archbishop, being at Ripon, assigned to the seceders from St. Mary's some land about three miles distant that they might there found a monastery for themselves. The spot of ground had never been inhabited unless by wild beasts, being overgrown with wood and brambles, lying between two steep hills and rocks, covered with wood on all sides, more proper for a retreat of wild beasts than the human species. This was called Skell-dale, that is, the Vale of Skell, a rivulet running through it from the west to the eastward part of it; the archbishop also gave to them a neighbouring village called Sutton. Richard, the Prior of St. Mary's at York, was chosen abbot of the monks, being the first of this monastery of Fountains, with whom they withdrew into this uncouth desert, without any house to shelter them in that winter season, or provisions to subsist on, but entirely dependent on the Divine providence. There stood a large elm in the midst of the vale, on which they put some thatch or straw, and under that they lay, ate, and prayed; the bishop for a time supplying them with bread, and the rivulet with drink. Part of the day some spent in making wattles to erect a little oratory, while others cleared some ground to make a little garden.

Burton records a tradition that the monks lived under a group of yew-trees on the hill-side until their house was built. On the south side of the house, where the abbey stood, about midway in ascending the hill, are five or six yew-trees all (in 1757) growing except the largest, which was blown down a few years ago; they are of an almost incredible size—the circumference of the trunk of one of

them is at least fourteen feet at about a yard from the ground, and the branches in proportion to the trunk. They are all nearly of the same bulk, and are so near each other as to make an excellent cover, almost equal to that of a thatched roof. We may suppose that they took shelter first under the elm-tree, and in a day or two found out this group of yews amidst the wood which clothed the hill-side, and removed to the better shelter of the thick evergreen foliage till they had built themselves a more substantial shelter.

The winter being over, the monks resolved to follow the rule of the Cistercian order, and accordingly they sent messengers to St. Bernard at Clairvaux, and the archbishop wrote likewise on their behalf. With the messengers who had been sent to Clairvaux, St. Bernard sent back one Geoffrey, a monk of his own monastery, who instructed these monks of Fountains in the Cistercian rule, and caused them to build cottages for their cells and offices. Their number was likewise increased by ten priests and laymen, who resorted to them, and were received as novices; but their possessions were not yet enlarged, nor had they any other sustenance than what the archbishop allowed them; and that year proving scarce, they were reduced to such straits, that after the abbot had been round the neighbourhood to beg, without success, they were reduced to feed on the leaves of trees and herbs gathered in the fields, and boiled with a little salt.

At this time a stranger coming to beg a morsel of bread, only two loaves and a half were found for all the monks, one of which the abbot caused to be given to the stranger, saying, God would provide for them; which was accordingly done; for immediately two men came from the neighbouring castle of Knaresborough with a

cart-load of fine bread, sent by Eustace Fitz John, who had been informed of their great want. Thus they passed that summer till the harvest, when they gathered some small store.

After they had laboured two years under those hardships, and were upon the point of leaving the place, and going away to St. Bernard at Clairvaux, who was about to assign to them one of the granges belonging to his abbey, Hugh, Dean of York, falling sick, ordered himself and all that he had to be carried to the monastery of Fountains, and being a wealthy person he brought relief to the house. Not long after two canons of York, both very rich in gold and silver, devoted themselves and all that they had to this monastery. Soon after, Robert de Sartis, a knight, and Reganelda his wife gave their town of Harleshowe, with the adjacent fields, and the forest of Warkesall, and they were both interred here. And Serlo de Pembroke, being very ill, and near death, gave the village of Caiton, and dying at Fountains, was there buried. Soon after this the abbot obtained the grange of Aldeburgh, with all thereto belonging; and from this time the abbey increased in possessions without, and in number of monks within.

But the monks were industrious and skilful farmers, and flourished as industrious settlers in the backwoods often do. Barren commons were soon dotted over with sheep; rushy valleys were drained, and became rich pastures filled with cattle; great clearings in the forest waved with ripening rye and barley. The revenues of the monastery rapidly augmented; little of them was required for the coarse dress and frugal fare of the monks; they did not, like the lay landowners, spend them on gilded armour, and jewelled robes, and troops of armed retainers, and journeys to court; and so they

had enough for plentiful charity and liberal hospitality, and the surplus they spent in gradually rearing those magnificent buildings whose very ruins are among the architectural glories of the land. As the monasteries became wealthy, their abbots took rank among the neighbouring nobles; and these great corporations, united by ties of sympathy and interest, exercised great influence in the country.

No one who is really acquainted with the history of England in the Middle Ages will underrate the value of the religious houses. The monks set the example of skilful cultivation of the waste lands of the country; they were beneficent lords to their tenants and servants; protectors of the liberties of the people in the midst of the tyranny of the feudal ages; the great cultivators of learning and the arts; the great educators of the people; the centres of religious zeal. These were times when all men with common interests banded together for combined defence against oppression, and for mutual help in their pursuits; and so religious men banded together into these powerful corporations, and their houses were the great citadels of the Church, without which religion would hardly have held its ground amidst the violence, and ignorance, and worldliness of the age.

But while so much is to be said in favour of the monastic communities, there was one very serious drawback to their beneficial influence on the nation. The support given to these great auxiliary institutions which were added to the system of the ancient Church of England tended to weaken the hands of the bishops and clergy who had the cure of the souls of the people. This came to pass partly through the system of *Appropriation*,

which has had so disastrous an effect on the Church of England from that day to this that it needs to be described here.

The Normans introduced the custom into England of endowing the monasteries which they founded or supported, not only with land and money, but also with the rectories of which they had become patrons. They gave the benefice to the convent, and the convent, as a religious corporation, took upon itself the office of rector, and provided a vicar to perform the spiritual duties of the cure. The apportionment of the temporalities of the benefice usually was that the convent took the great tithe, of corn, &c., which formed the far larger portion of the benefice, and gave the vicar the small tithe and fees, and (if it were not too large) the rectory house and glebe for his maintenance. The position of a poor vicar was very different in dignity and emolument, in prestige in the eyes of his parishioners, and in the means of conferring temporal benefits upon them, from that of the old rectors, his predecessors in the cure. The fashion of appropriating benefices was gradually extended to the support of cathedral chapters, hospitals, guilds, &c. By the time of the Reformation about half of the livings of England and Wales had thus become appropriated.

We can only briefly mention here some other causes which diminished the usefulness of the secular clergy: the Papal provisions which conferred English benefices on foreigners; the allowance of pluralities; the permitting men in minor orders to hold benefices; the use of bishoprics, dignities, and benefices as rewards to those engaged in the civil service of the country. All these causes together did much to deteriorate the influence and usefulness of the secular, *i. e.* the parochial clergy.

Suffragan bishops may have been learned, pious, and zealous, but they could not wield the authority or exercise the influence of the diocesan; so curates in charge of a parish could not really fill the place of the rector; no *locum tenens* can fulfil the duties of an absentee.

CHAPTER XVI

THE FRIARS

We have seen in the preceding chapters how the ancient parochial system of the Church of England was overshadowed by the greater prestige of the monastic orders, and how its resources were drained off on every side to feed other interests than the cure of souls and the help of the poor. The consequences were soon felt. As the population increased, the clergy were not able to supply its spiritual needs. In the towns of England, the condition of the poor in the 13th century bore a resemblance to that which forms the great and painful problem of our own days. Foul, crowded dwellings, in undrained and unscavenged quarters of the towns, inducing leprosy and occasional visitations of plague, extreme poverty, ignorance, vice, and misery, were among the characteristics of the Middle Ages as they are of our own.

It was to meet this condition of things that the orders of friars were founded in the 13th century, and they occupy an important place in the subsequent history of the Church down to the Reformation.

The friars were a different order of men from the monks; their institution was based on a totally different idea. The principle of monachism was seclusion from the world and abstraction from worldly affairs, for the sake of religious meditation and spiritual self-culture. To this end monasteries were founded in places remote from the abodes of men, and he who least often suffered

his feet or his thoughts to wander beyond the cloister was, so far, the best monk. The principle which inspired the friars was that of self-devotion to the performance of active religious duties among men. Dominic saw infidelity spreading over Christendom, and founded an order of men who should be learned and eloquent preachers, capable of dealing with the infidelity of the time. Francis was impressed with the miseries of the poor, especially those of the towns, and founded an order of men who should give themselves to works of charity, and to an earnest, affectionate proclamation of the Gospel among the poor. The friars were, in fact, the home missionaries of their time; and the zeal and earnestness and self-devotion of their early labours, falling upon times when such agencies were greatly needed, produced very striking results. "Till the days of Martin Luther," says Sir James Stephen, "the Church had never seen so great and effectual a reform as theirs. . . . Nothing in the histories of Wesley or of Whitfield can be compared with the enthusiasm which everywhere welcomed them, or with the immediate visible result of their labours." Both Francis and Dominic took great pains to fit their followers for the office of preachers and teachers, sending them in large numbers to the universities, and founding colleges of their own there, to receive their students. They cultivated the whole range of science and art, holding (rightly) that theology is the queen of sciences, and that the man of God should be thoroughly furnished with all knowledge, human and divine. So successful were they that in a short time the professorial chairs of Europe were almost monopolized by the learned members of the mendicant orders. Their numbers rapidly increased. Their houses were usually built in the suburbs of the towns, because their work lay among the masses of

the people; but they seem also to have parcelled out the country districts, and organized a regular system of itinerant preachers among them. They did not restrict their labours to the ignorant and poor, but were equally diligent among all classes. They were immensely popular; the profession of asceticism impressed the unreasoning crowd, which is always affected by the dramatic exhibition of austerity and the profession of extraordinary sanctity, and undervalues the virtue which is only seen in the godly regulation of a life of ordinary every-day occupations. The Pope had given them a constitution which made them independent of the authority of the bishops, and empowered them to exercise their office everywhere without regard to the territorial rights of the parochial clergy. They were something like what the Wesleyan preachers would have been if the Church of that day had adopted Wesley's movement, and incorporated his preachers into a special order of clergy, and given them licence to go and execute their mission in all the parishes of England.

It was very hard on the parochial clergy to see their parishes intruded into by popular rivals who did not always spare to satirize them to their faces, and to see their influence undermined and their spiritual functions superseded. The lord monks were the aristocratic order of the clergy; the friars were the popular order; to the secular clergy fell the humble duty of caring regularly and daily for the souls of the people committed to their charge, as well as they could, with these irregular helps and under all these disadvantages.

There came at length a reaction. The monastic orders, as they grew wealthy, suffered a diminution of their primitive zeal. They were accused by the lower classes of pride, and envied by the higher classes for

their wealth and power. The friars suffered a like deterioration of their original self-denial and spirituality; the fact that they lived entirely on the alms of the people tended to encourage the use of those little acts of popularity-hunting which injure the usefulness of a minister of religion, and lower his moral tone. And by the middle of the 14th century we find Chaucer elaborating a beautiful description of the evangelical virtues of the poor parson of a town, while he satirizes the jolly fox-hunting monk and the hypocritical cant and money-getting tricks of the friar.

CHAPTER XVII

FALSE DOCTRINES AND SUPERSTITIOUS PRACTICES OF THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH

It is not within the scope of our plan to consider all the errors in doctrine and all the superstitious practices which gradually arose in the Middle Ages, but we shall treat of some of them which exercised special influence on the faith and practice of Christian people, or which have a special interest in relation to the history of the Reformation or to the questions of the present day. It may be convenient to give at once a list of those which have been selected. The *cultus* of the Blessed Virgin Mary; the doctrine of the Holy Communion; purgatory, and the subjects connected with it, viz., prayers and masses for the dead; indulgences; saint worship.

The gravest of all the errors of the mediæval Church was that by which the Blessed Virgin Mary was gradually raised in the popular devotion to a rank above that of a mere mortal, and put into the office of a mediator between sinners and Christ. The position of the Virgin —mother of Incarnate God—was very wonderful and mysterious; but that it did not give her any special rights over her Son, or special relation to His redeeming work, seems to be intentionally and clearly indicated in the passages of Holy Scripture which speak of her relations to Him. "Son, why hast Thou thus dealt with us? . . . How is it that ye sought Me? wist ye not that I

must be about My Father's business?" "Thy mother and Thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with Thee. . . And He stretched forth His hand to His disciples and said, Behold My mother and My brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of My Father which is in heaven, the same is My brother and sister and mother." And strongest of all, both in the natural feeling which attributed a special character to the Virgin, and in our Lord's warning response to it, "Blessed is the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou hast sucked. . . Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God and keep it."

The discussions about the heresy of Nestorius in the 4th century seem first to have led to a general and deep consideration of the subject. The decision of the Council of Ephesus, that from the moment of the conception in the womb of the Virgin of the human nature of our Lord the Divine nature was united with it, and the title in which the truth was expressed—Theotokos, served to perpetuate a realization of the wonderful honour which had been conferred on the lowly maiden; and titles of reverence and affection began to be given her.

The first unfounded honour attributed to her is that on her death she was taken body and soul to heaven. In the 4th century Epiphanius says her end was not known. The tradition of her assumption to heaven on her death is first mentioned by Sophronius in the 5th century as a doubtful tradition. John Damascenus, in the 8th, first relates it as a fact.

The first attribution of anything remarkable to the birth of the Virgin occurs in the 12th century. Until that time the universal belief of the Church was that she, like all other mortals, was conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity. The Fathers frequently point

out the difference between the conception without sin of Jesus, and the conception in sin of His mother. To limit ourselves to those connected with the history of our own Church, Gregory the Great, the Venerable Bede, Alcuin,[1] Anselm,[2] write very clearly on the subject. It was in the middle of the 12th century that some monks of Lyons, during a vacancy of the see, desired to celebrate a festival of the Conception of the Virgin. St. Bernard wrote to them against it as "a novelty," "an error," and "a superstition," arguing that only Jesus Christ was conceived without sin. But the opinion of the immaculate conception of the Virgin began to be entertained. Duns Scotus, in the 14th century, stated it as a scholastic proposition, and argued in favour of it. Thomas Aquinas opposed it. Scotus was a Franciscan, Aquinas a Dominican; the two orders took up the dispute warmly, and the whole Church was ranged on one side or the other. It remained an open question till in 1854 the Council of the Vatican decreed the dogma of the Immaculate Conception as an article of faith.

But throughout the 13th and following centuries an excessive veneration was paid to the Virgin above that which was paid to all other saints. The Roman theologians distinguish it indeed from the worship paid to God; but it is often difficult to reconcile the language offered to her with anything short of the highest worship. For example, in Saint Bonaventura's Psalter of the Virgin, which substitutes the name of "our Lady" for that of

[1] "The body of Jesus Christ was derived from that of the Virgin, who was corrupted by original sin."

[2] "Though the conception of Jesus is pure and without any sin of the flesh, yet the Virgin herself, from whom He was derived, was conceived in sin, and her mother conceived her in sin, and she was born with original sin."

"our Lord," we have such results as these: Psalm xxx., "In Thee, O Lady, have I trusted;" and Psalm lxvii., "Let Mary arise, and let her enemies be scattered." Or, again, in the paraphrase of the *Te Deum*—

> "We praise thee, Mother of God, we acknowledge thee, Mary the Virgin!
> O Lady, save thy people.
> Vouchsafe, O sweet Mary, to keep us, now and for ever, without sin."

The Roman theologians admit that the Virgin is put in the place of a mediatrix between us and Christ. Gabriel Biel expresses the doctrine clearly thus: "You are afraid of approaching the Father. As He gave you Jesus for a Mediator, what could not such a Son obtain from such a Father? But perhaps even in Him you fear the Divine Majesty, because although He became man, yet He remained God. Betake yourself to Mary, for Mary is pure humanity. The Son will surely hear the Mother, and the Father will hear the Son." And these were not merely pious opinions of a few, which had no great practical influence on the religion of the people; the worship of the Virgin, and the resort to her as a compassionate intercessor, formed a very considerable part of the practical religion of a large proportion of the people. The effect was to intercept the worship due to God; to obscure the truth that there is only one Mediator—all-sufficient and infinitely merciful—between God and man; and to encourage laxity of life by leading men to hope for an easier pardon through Mary, than they could obtain through Christ.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.—To use the words of Bishop Harold Browne, in his 'Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles,' "Thus much is unquestionable, the whole primi-

tive Church evidently believed in *a presence* of Christ in the Eucharist. All spoke of feeding there on Christ—eating His body and drinking His blood. But then was it a spiritual presence or a carnal presence? Did they teach a carnal eating and drinking of Christ's natural flesh and blood? or did they intend a spiritual manducation—an eating spiritually and a drinking in by the soul of the life-giving efficacy of the body broken and the blood shed? Did they believe the bread and wine to be actually and literally transmuted into flesh and blood? Did they think the bread and wine still to remain bread and wine, though constituted sacraments of Christ, means in God's hand of conveying to us Christ's body and blood, and so, after Christ's own example, to be called by the *name* of His body and blood?" And, after quoting from the Fathers, he asks, "May it not be safely concluded that, weighing all considerations, and notwithstanding some remarkable phrases, the doctrine of the early ages was not in favour of a miraculous change in the consecrated elements, not in favour of a carnal presence of the natural Body of the Lord, but in favour of a real, effectual, life-giving presence of Christ's spiritual Body communicated to the faith and feeding the souls of His disciples?" It was not in the spirit of the early ages to give accurate definitions of such doctrinal points; the tendency was rather to veil them in reverential mystery, to accept the religious facts and not to enter into philosophical explanations of the facts. But in the Middle Ages arose a new spirit of philosophical inquiry, which, accepting the doctrines of religion, analyzed and defined and explained and systematized them, and showed their conformity with sound reason. To this spirit of the scholastic philosophy we owe the long controversy as to the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist.

The controversy begins about A.D. 831 with Paschasius Radbert, a monk and afterwards abbot of Corbie, who was the first to expound and defend at length the doctrine of a change after consecration in the substance of the elements of bread and wine. The work created a great sensation in the Church, and Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Metz, a divine of the highest credit and reputation, wrote against Paschasius. The famous Johnnes Scotus Erigena, probably a native of Ireland, wrote at the desire of King Charles the Bald a book against the substantial change in the sacrament. These two answers are lost, but another, written by Bertram or Ratramnus, another monk of Corbie, by desire of Charles the Bald, is still extant, and is one of the great works on the subject.[1] His doctrine is contained in this brief extract: "The change [produced by the consecration of the bread and wine] is not wrought corporeally, but spiritually and figuratively. Under the veil of the material bread and wine the spiritual body and blood of Christ exist. . . . Both (the bread and wine) as they are corporeally handled are in their nature corporeal creatures; but according to their virtue, and what they become spiritually, they are the mysteries of Christ's body and blood. . . . By all that hath been hitherto said, it appears that the body and blood of Christ, which are received by the mouths of the faithful in the Church, are figures in respect of their visible nature; but in respect of the invisible substance, that is, the power of the word of God, they are truly Christ's body and blood. Wherefore as they are visible creatures they feed the body; but as they have the virtue of a more powerful substance, they do both feed and sanctify the souls of the faithful."

[1] It was the perusal of Ratramnus which influenced Ridley and Cranmer in their views of the Holy Communion.

The dispute continued for ages, and the principles of Paschasius slowly gained ground. The Saxon Church, protected by its insular position, withstood longer the growing opinion. Some of the writings of one of the most learned of the ecclesiastics of the later Anglo-Saxon Church, Elfric, the homilist, contain clear statements on the subject. "This is not," he says, "that body in which He suffered for us, but spiritually it is made His body and blood." "That housel (*i. e.* the Eucharist) is Christ's body, not bodily but ghostly [spiritually]; not the body which He suffered in, but the body of which He spake, when He blessed bread and wine to housel, a night before His suffering, &c." Berengarius, Archdeacon of Angers, one of the most famous teachers of the middle of the 11th century, opposed the opinion of Paschasius, which by that time had become the most generally received opinion. The passions of the clergy were aroused against him; he was condemned once and again as a heretic, and on both occasions recanted under fear of death. What specially concerns us is that his former friend Lanfranc, then Prior of Bec, at the height of his reputation as a scholar, entered actively into the controversy against Berengarius; so that we may be sure that when the Norman Conquest opened the Church of England to the influence of the religious ideas of the Continent, under the guidance of Lanfranc as archbishop, the current opinions on the subject of the Eucharist would begin to spread among the English clergy and people.

It was not till A.D. 1215, in the fourth Council of Lateran, held by Innocent III., that the full form of the doctrine of transubstantiation was sanctioned and made authoritative. One of its chapters declared that in the sacrifice of the Mass "Christ's body and blood are really

contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into His body, and the wine into His blood." And this doctrine became an article of the faith in all the Churches which held the Roman communion. This definition, however, still left room for a wide difference of opinion. The vulgar, perhaps, received it in its most gross obvious meaning, as gross as that indicated by the stories of people seeing a little child, instead of the consecrated host, lying on the paten; or as that indicated in the story of the Jew who blasphemously stabbed the host with his knife, and blood issued from the wounds. But the philosophy of the Middle Ages made a distinction between the substance and the accidents of a thing. The accidents included the size, shape, texture, feel, smell,—all, in short, which is apparent to the senses, while the substance is a supposed something which forms the basis of these accidents. The word transubstantiation, and its definition, assert no more than that the *substance* of the bread and wine are changed, while the *accidents* remain the same. To all the senses it still appears to be bread; the change which has taken place is in this *substance*, which is only a philosophical idea. Bishop Harold Browne says: "Now it is almost questionable whether the accidents do not comprise all the properties of *matter*. If so this change may still [according to the Roman definition] be spiritual rather than material." And some great writers subsequent to the famous Lateran Council seem to have held it in such a sense, *e. g.* St. Bernard, Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, Cardinal Cajetan.[1]

A change of practice speedily followed upon the establishment of the new doctrine. The cup was gradually

[1] The Roman doctrine of transubstantiation has never been adopted by the Greek Church.

withheld from the laity, on the ground of reverence, lest the sacred blood might perchance be spilled on the ground; the bread was for the like reason put into the mouth of the communicant, a cloth being held beneath to catch any crumbs which might fall. Then the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist became exaggerated, and the sacramental view fell into comparative neglect. Then came the reservation of the host, not according to primitive practice, for communicating persons unavoidably absent, but to be placed over the altar in order to retain there the actual presence of Christ for the purpose of worship. The idea of the sacrament as a means of grace, to be received once a day if that were the earliest practice of the Church, or once a week according to its more normal practice, was obscured. Pious people were satisfied to communicate once a year, at Easter. Bishop Poore, in the 13th century, advises female recluses—persons of special devotion—not to communicate oftener than twelve times a year.

PURGATORY.—The doctrine of the Bible, as witnessed by the uniform belief of the Jews and of the early Christians, is that at death the soul goes into the place of departed spirits, called hades or hell, where the souls that have died in Christ enjoy rest and a foretaste of their coming happiness, and the souls of the wicked have a fearful looking forward to the coming woe; that at the resurrection all rise again in their bodies and undergo the judgment; and that then the redeemed go back with Jesus to heaven, and the lost depart into the outer darkness. The doctrine of purgatory is briefly this, that in the intermediate state between death and resurrection there are three conditions, in one of which the soul is; the saints go straight to heaven, the lost go straight to

hell, but those who have died not saintly enough for heaven, and not so wicked as to deserve hell, go to a middle place called purgatory, and there suffer a less or greater degree of punishment for a shorter or longer time, according to their deserts. Augustine in the 4th century mentioned it as an opinion entertained by some, that after death some further purging by fire awaits those who were not fully purified here; and he says, "I shall not argue against it, for perhaps it is true." He is usually quoted as the principal authority for the early belief of the Church in purgatory. Gregory the Great in his 'Dialogues' gave incidentally his views of the condition of the soul after death, which included a more definite doctrine of a purgatory of purifying fire than that of any previous great theologian; but it was apparently a novel opinion in his day, and was certainly not generally held in the Church. In Bede we find traces of the influence of Gregory's doctrine upon the Saxon Church. Otto Frisingensis, in A.D. 1146, writes: "Some affirm that there is in the unseen state a place of purgatory, in which those who are to be saved are either troubled with darkness only, or are refined by the fire of expiation." It was then still in the 12th century only an opinion of some, and not a doctrine of the Church. But it was put forth authoritatively by the Council of Florence in A.D. 1438, in these words: "If any true penitents shall depart this life in the love of God before they have made satisfaction by worthy fruits of penance for faults of commission and omission, their souls are purified after death by the pains of purgatory." And this was confirmed by the Council of Trent, 1563, and taught in the creed of Pope Pius IV., with the addition, that "the souls there detained are aided by the suffrages of the faithful."

Connected with this doctrine of purgatory was that of INDULGENCES. At first an indulgence was nothing more than a remission of part of his penance to a penitent who showed special signs of repentance. But it gradually grew into a theory that the Church had power, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ and the saints, to remit part of the punishment of purgatory to those who deserved it by any meritorious religious act. Bishops would publish so many days' indulgence (*i. e.* so many days less of the punishment of purgatory) to those who were present at the consecration of a new church, or made a certain pilgrimage, or said a certain prayer. At last it came to giving indulgences to those who gave a certain sum in alms—*i. e.* who bought them. Pope Urban II., A.D. 1095, began the system by granting a plenary indulgence to the Crusaders, "whosoever for devotion sake, and not for honour or money, shall go to Jerusalem to liberate the Church of God, that journey shall be counted instead of all his penance." It reached its greatest height of corruption in the pontificate of Leo X., who raised money by the general and public sale of indulgences; and it was the scandal created by the conduct of Tetzel, the agent of this traffic in Germany, which was one of the immediate causes of the Reformation in that country. The practical tendency of the doctrine, as vulgarly understood, in conjunction with the belief in the efficacy of prayers and masses for the dead, tended to undermine the sanctions of morality; to make the working out a man's salvation to consist not in self-restraint and willing obedience to the precepts of the Gospel, but in buying pardons while he lived, or leaving money to get himself prayed out of purgatory after he died; or trusting to the charity of his relations to do it for him; or, finally, to the hope that the super-

abundance of the merits of Christ and the saints might be enough to get him out of pain at last, though he did not pay the priests for their interest in the matter. Its tendency was to lead men to live in this world as they pleased, and postpone the salvation of their souls to the intermediate state.

SAINT WORSHIP.—The early Christians held the article of the Creed, "I believe in the communion of saints," with a more vivid faith than is common among us now. They habitually thought of the saints departed as still living, conscious, mindful of their past life, and not forgetful of those who had been dear to them on earth. They did not doubt that they still offered prayers and worship to God through our Lord Jesus Christ; and if they still remembered those dear to them, and still prayed to God, they could not doubt that they would pray to God for those friends. Thus in the later sepulchral inscriptions in the Roman catacombs there were illustrations of natural feeling in such phrases as, "Pray for us," "pray for your wife," "for your children," "for your sister." But there is no necessary connection between this faith and the theory that if we call upon the saints departed they can hear us. Gregory Nazianzen, towards the end of the 4th century, is said to be the first theologian in whose writings we find anything like an address to the spirits of the dead, and these are in two instances in which he utters a rhetorical apostrophe to departed persons, and in both cases the apostrophe is qualified by an expression of doubt—"*if* thou hast any sense or perception of those things;" "*if* pious souls have such honour of God that they perceive such things." But this gradually grew into a belief that the saints do hear us, and will, if asked, pray for us; that we may

venture to go to them and ask their intercession with Christ when we fear directly to approach Christ. Then came the attaching oneself to some special saint, and frequently invoking his mediation. Until at length, in the popular religion of ignorant times and countries, the Virgin and the saints were worshipped and prayed to, as a kind of lesser deities; particular countries and towns and families put themselves under the protection of a favourite saint; and the shrines of popular saints became the scenes of local cults as numerous and superstitious as were furnished by the ancient mythologies.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE RELIGIOUS CONDITION OF THE COUNTRY: SKETCH OF THE CHURCH IN THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY

We have traced the Church of England from one eventful period to another down these centuries of its long history. Let us now take our stand at this point of time, and look round and try to gather a general view of the state of the mediæval Church of England and the religious condition of the people.

The England of that period was very different from the England of to-day. It was chiefly a pastoral country; its great export was wool, its chief manufacture a little coarse cloth. The country was in great part unreclaimed; there were great forests and wide tracts of moorland and meres and marshes. The king's highways from town to town were barely passable by vehicles in winter, and the bye-roads were little more than bridle-tracks from one village to another. The country for the most part was unenclosed pasture, like the Sussex Downs or Salisbury Plain. The towns were small, many of them enclosed within walls, with narrow streets of picturesque timber houses, guild-halls and churches, and plenty of garden and orchard ground behind the houses, between street and street. The villages consisted of a few straggling cottages round the village green. The castles of the nobles, the manor-houses of the country knights, and the farm-houses of the yeomen scattered over the land, complete the view of its civil inhabitants. The ecclesiastical

establishment of the country bore a far larger proportion to the whole country than it does now. The cathedrals were in the height of their magnificence. For four hundred years, ever since the Conquest, most of them had been in building, and many of them were still unfinished. Their shells remain to us, and astonish us with the grandeur of their conception, the costliness of their building, and the beauty of their art. But what remains to us is only the shell. The interiors were then full of chapels, shrines, and tombs of great men; the windows were filled with painted glass; the walls hung with trophies which had been accumulating for centuries; the knightly achievement was suspended on the wall in one place, the palmer's staff and scrip in another; rich palls were cast over tombs. The accessory buildings were still uninjured:—if it were a monastic foundation, there was the cloister in the angle between nave and transept; round it the chapter-house, the refectory, the dormitory, and the scriptorium; if a foundation of secular canons, the houses of the great officials of the cathedral, and the college of the vicars choral, and the school of the choristers, were placed as convenience dictated. The bishop's palace stood detached at a little distance. Cathedral, palace, cloister, residence houses, vicar's college, and boys' school, all were enclosed within walls and guarded by gate-towers, like a little citadel within the city. Over one of the gateways was the great room in which the bishop's court was held, and, hard by, the prison for those who were condemned to it.

The towns had many more churches in proportion to their inhabitants than our modern towns. Even yet, in our old towns like Norwich or Colchester, the modern citizen is surprised at the number of churches, though the old towns were far less populous, and some of the

old churches have been destroyed. The various companies and guilds had their chapels; sometimes they were within the churches, often they were separate buildings attached to their guild-halls. The town churches had their chantry chapels founded by wealthy citizens, and the tombs of those citizens enriched the interior. Moreover, there was usually a friary, or several of them, within the town or just without its walls; and in many of the churchyards were chambers built for recluses; so that the whole ecclesiastical establishment of a town—rectors and vicars, chantry priests and guild priests, private chaplains of wealthy citizens, parish clerks, and men in minor orders, friars and recluses—was very much more considerable than the two or three vicars and half-a-dozen curates of a modern town. Few towns were without two or three charitable establishments—schools for education, almshouses for poor people, hospitals for the sick; and all these were organized on a religious basis. The masters of the schools were clergymen. The alms-houses had their little chapel, and the alms-people formed a little religious community, with a distinguishing dress, and some simple rules, under the control of the chaplain. The hospital was served by physicians and surgeons, dressers and nurses, who had undertaken the work for the love of Christ, and were organized into a religious community.

The villages were perhaps religiously worse off then than now, for in many cases, as we have seen, the rector was an absentee, or in minor orders, and the actual cure was in the hands of a priest who served for a poor stipend.

But besides the body of *secular* clergy, comprising the bishops and cathedral establishments, the town clergy, and the scattered country incumbents, there were two

other distinct establishments of *regular* clergy, each as numerous, wealthy, and important. There was only one cathedral in each diocese, but every county had three or four or half-a-dozen monasteries; and many of these had churches quite as noble as any of the cathedrals. The abbot's house was as great as a bishop's palace, and had an establishment as large. The cloister buildings, the lodgings of the prior and the other officials, the hospitium for entertaining guests, the schools, hospitals, and almshouses attached, formed a vast establishment, all surrounded by walls with gate-towers like a town. A village of dependents clustered outside the walls, growing in some cases into an important town, as at Bury St. Edmunds or Wenlock. The possessions of the monasteries were large and scattered; and every here and there, where there was an outlying estate, there was also a cell, *i. e.* a miniature monastery, with its chapel and domestic buildings, inhabited by two or three monks and their dependents, who looked after the estates. It was probably in these outlying cells, occupied by monks who were chosen rather for their business-like capability than for their earnest piety, and who were removed from the control of their superiors, that breaches of monastic discipline most frequently occurred.

The abbots were great noblemen, some of them being regularly summoned to Parliament with the barons and bishops. The convents[1] were powerful bodies, with wealth, numerous tenants and retainers, and great social influence.

Then there was a third establishment of itinerant preachers—the friars. They were divided into four chief orders—the Dominican, Franciscan, Austin (Augusti-

[1] The convent is the community of monks as distinguished from the abbot.

nian), and Carmelite; but we may consider them here as one great body, numerous and influential, having their houses chiefly in the great towns, but sending their members on circuit into every village in the country.

In the Middle Ages the Church was a great popular institution. Since the Reformation it has retained the confidence of the upper classes, and has had undisputed charge of the agricultural poor; but, for one reason or other, it has not thoroughly satisfied the needs and won the affections of the lower half of the middle class, among whom dissent of various forms has consequently found its adherents. It remains to be seen whether the great revival of religion in this century will succeed—as seems at present likely—in popularizing the Church anew among all classes, and winning over the great mass of the people to confidence and attachment to her. One reason, no doubt, of the popularity of the mediæval Church was that it had always been the champion of the people and the friend of the poor. In politics the Church was always on the side of the liberties of the people against the tyranny of the feudal lords. In the eye of the nobles the labouring population were beings of an inferior caste; in the eye of the law they were chattels; in the eye of the Church they were brethren in Christ, souls to be won and trained and fitted for heaven. In social life the Church was an easy landlord and a kind master.

The Church was the great channel by which men might hope to rise in life. The clergy were quick to recognize mental ability, and ready to train it to usefulness. Any clever lad had an opportunity of being educated at the school of the monastery, sent thence to the college which the Order maintained for its own scholars at the university, and so becoming a clerk. And

from the ranks of these clerks the civil service of the State, as well as the offices of the Church, were supplied. So that every clever lad had open to him through the Church the possibility of rising to the highest wealth and dignity. But it was not for the sake of gratifying the ambition of individuals that the mediæval Church used to search out and educate talented youths; it was from sounder and higher motives. It was from the belief that these "talents" were what this metaphorical name implies, gifts of God, to be cultivated not only by the individual who possessed them, but by those who had control over him, for the use of society and for the glory of God. This is well brought out in a discussion among the commissioners for the regulation (among other things) of the grammar-school of Canterbury Cathedral at the time of the Reformation. Some of the commissioners wished to exclude from the benefits of the school all but sons of gentlemen. Archbishop Cranmer argued that "poor men's children are often endowed with many singular gifts of nature, which are also the gifts of God." It was replied that "it was meet for the ploughman's son to go to plough, and the artificer's son to apply the trade of his parent's vocation, and the gentlemen's children are meant to have the knowledge of government and rule in the commonwealth." The archbishop replied, that "utterly to exclude the ploughman's son and the poor man's son from the benefits of learning, as though they were unworthy to have the gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them as well as upon others, is as much as to say that Almighty God should not be at liberty to bestow His great gifts of grace upon any person but as we and other men shall appoint them to be employed;" and so he stood firm for admitting poor men's sons as well as gentlemen's sons, as heretofore, to the advantages

of that education which would fit them for the highest offices of Church and State. Thousands of men did actually thus rise from the lowest ranks to the highest. Such men knew the life of the classes from which they had sprung, their circumstances and needs, their modes of thought and feeling, and sympathized with them and helped them. All this tended to increase the popularity of the mediæval Church.

All these things together made the Church more powerful in the Middle Ages than now. The great landed possessions of the prelates, the large proportion they bore to the lay lords in the House of Peers, and the fact that all the great civil officials of Government and of the courts of law—secretaries of State, ambassadors, and judges—were taken from her ranks, gave her a vast influence. The great numbers of the clergy (including the friars) brought them more thoroughly into contact with the whole people. The fact that learning was almost confined to their body, and the universal belief in the sacredness of their office, gave them more influence with the people.

And on the whole, with many drawbacks, the mediæval Church did its duty—according to its own lights—to the people. It had vast political influence, and used it on the side of the liberties of the people. It was the great cultivator of learning and art, and it did its best to educate the people. It is the Popish Church since the Reformation which is open to the charge of designedly withholding knowledge from the people, for they have found that knowledge is fatal to Papal pretensions and mediæval errors. It is in these latter days that Ultramontanism has allied itself with despotism against the political liberties of people who ask for religious reform together with civil freedom.

If we look to the great ends for which a Christian Church is incorporated in a nation—viz., to make known the Gospel to the people, to establish institutions and form habits which shall restrain vice and immorality, to train up individual souls in growing holiness of life, to offer an acceptable worship to Almighty God—we must in justice declare that even the corrupt mediæval Church did not altogether fail of its duty. By means of its painting and sculpture in the churches, its mystery plays, its religious festivals, its catechizing, and its preaching,[1] it is probable that the chief facts of the Gospel history and the doctrines of the creeds were more universally known and more vividly realized than among the masses of our present population. The morals of the people were lax—those who best know the morals of our town poor and our peasantry will be slowest to provoke comparisons; but at least the ancient Church discipline tried to control and to stigmatize vices which now rage unchecked and unreproved. The monastic institution set up a standard of saintliness, of which thousands of monks and nuns and friars fell far short, but which tens of thousands of men and women, both in the cloisters and in the world, aimed at, and towards which they did daily grow.

It is no new thing that people should be better than their opinions. The spiritual digestion, like that of the body, seems to have a power of discrimination, and the spiritual life, like the bodily, often thrives on very inferior

[1] The constitutions of Archbishop Peckham, *i. e.* the Church laws passed by the Synod of Canterbury towards the end of the 13th century, order the parochial clergy to preach, by themselves or by a substitute, every quarter of a year; to expound in a popular manner the Creed, the Commandments, the twofold precept of love to God and our neighbour, the seven works of charity, the seven deadly sins, the seven principal virtues, and the seven sacraments.

food. On the other hand, alas! it is no new fact that people may have the soundest theology and not live according to it, may have abundant means of grace and not use them. The system of compensation, which we observe in other departments of life, seems to obtain here also; so that no one need think that we are unduly depreciating our present religious state and exalting that of the unreformed Church, when we assert as an historical fact that Englishmen then were not so superstitious and vicious as we should have expected, and that Englishmen now are not so well-instructed and godly as they ought to be.

Especially the mediæval Church realized vividly a great truth which until lately had almost died out among us, that one great function of the Church of Christ is to offer to God an acceptable worship through Jesus Christ; and in their grand churches and religious communities set apart for the divine worship, in the solemn grandeur of the services offered daily, and seven times a day, they did present a worship which has perhaps only been exceeded in grandeur by that of the Temple of Jerusalem. It is quite gratuitous to suppose that, because it was grand and beautiful, it was not spiritual and earnest. Our modern Prayer Book, all admit, breathes the very spirit of reasonable and sober but earnest and fervent devotion; and our Morning and Evening Prayer are but a revision and abbreviation of Lauds, Prime, Terce, Sext, None and Compline, which the monks and nuns sang daily in every religious house in England from the time of Alfred the Great down to that of Henry VIII. It is true these Hours were not attended by the people. The Holy Communion was the service for the people; and we have already stated, and we have no desire to extenuate, the accumulation of errors which offered this

popular service in a language the people did not understand, which exaggerated the sacrificial aspect of it, and depreciated its sacramental aspect, and which denied the cup to the laity. It is curious that in course of time the monastic Hours intended for the clergy should have become our service for the people; and that our Holy Communion, which Christ ordained as the great evangelical service, the great commemoration and pleading of the Atonement, should have fallen into such general disuse, that perhaps nine out of ten of our church-going people never even saw it celebrated.

In the Middle Ages there were written a considerable number of manuals intended to teach the parish priest his duties. From these books we gather what the parish priest's practical work and teaching were like. One of these, written by John Myrk, a canon of Lilleshall Abbey, Shropshire, has recently been published,[1] and an extract from the editor's preface will help us to understand the practical, every-day working of the mediæval Church among the people. "To many," says the editor, "it will seem strange that these directions, written without the least thought of hostile criticism, when there was no danger in plain speaking, and no inducements to hide or soften down, should be so free from superstition. We have scarcely any of the nonsense which some people still think made up the greater part of the religion of the Middle Ages, but instead thereof good sound morality, such as it would be pleasant to hear preached at the present day. The instructor tells his pupils of the great evil it is to have ignorant clergy; how, instead of instructing their people, they, by their ill example, lead them into sin; how their preaching is worth but very

[1] By the Early English Text Society. Edited by Edward Peacock, Esq., F.S.A.

little if they tell lies or get drunk, are slothful, envious, or full of pride; how they may not without sin haunt taverns, or practise violent and cruel sports; may not dance nor wear 'cutted clothes and pyked schone,' nor go to fairs and markets, and strut about girt with swords and daggers like knights and esquires. On the other hand, he says, priests must be gentle and modest, given to hospitality and the reading of the psalter. They must avoid as much as may be the service of women, and especially of evil ones, eschew coarse jokes and ribald talking, and must be specially careful to shave the crown of their heads and their beards. The priest must not be content with simply knowing his own duties; he must be prepared to teach those under his charge all that Christian men and women should do and believe. We are told that when one has done a sin he must not continue long with it on his conscience, but go straight to the priest and confess it, lest he should forget before the great shriving time at Eastertide.

"Pregnant women especially are to go to their shrift and receive the Holy Communion at once. Our instructor is very strict on the duties of midwives—women they were really in those days. They are on no account to permit children to die unbaptized. If there be no priest at hand, they are to administer that sacrament themselves if they see danger of death. They must be especially careful to use the right form of words as our Lord taught; but it does not matter whether they say them in Latin or English, or whether the Latin be good or bad, so that the intention be to use the proper words. The water and the vessel that contained it are not to be again employed in domestic use, but to be burned or carried to the church and cast into the font. If no one else be at hand the parents themselves may baptize their

children. All infants are to be christened at Easter and Whitsuntide in the newly-blessed fonts, if there have not been necessity to administer the sacrament before. God-parents are to be careful to teach to their god-children the *Paternoster*, *Ave Maria*, and *Credo*, and not to sleep in the same bed with them until they are old enough to take care of themselves, lest they should be overlain. Neither are they to be sponsors to their god-children at confirmation, for they have already contracted a spiritual relationship. Both the god-parents and those who have held the child at its confirming are spiritual relatives, and may not afterwards contract marriage with it.

"Before weddings, banns are to be asked on three holidays; and all persons who contract irregular marriages, and the priests, clerks, and others that help thereat, are cursed for the same. The real presence of the body and blood of our Saviour in the sacrament of the altar is to be fully held; but the people are to bear in mind that the wine and water given to them after they have received communion is not a part of the sacrament. It is an important thing to behave reverently in church, for the church is God's house, not a place for idle prattle. When people go there they are not to jest, to loll against the pillars and walls, but kneel down on the floor and pray to their Lord for mercy and grace. When the Gospel is read they are to stand up and sign themselves with the cross; and when they hear the sanctus bell ring they are to kneel and worship their Maker in the blessed sacrament.

"All men are to show reverence when they see the priest carrying the host to the sick. Whether the ways be dirty or clean, they are not to think of their clothes, but reverently to kneel down 'to worshype Hym that alle hath wroghte.'

"The author gives some very interesting instructions about churchyards, which show, what we know from other circumstances to be the case, that they were sometimes treated with shameful irreverence. Of witchcraft we hear surprisingly little. Myrk's words are such that one might almost think he had some sceptical doubts on the subject. Not so with usury or 'okere'; the taking interest for money, or lending anything to get profit thereby, is, we are shown, 'a synne full grevus.' This was the universally received teaching in his day, and for many centuries after. Perhaps the most remarkable fluctuation of opinion that has taken place in the modern period is the silent change that has passed over men's minds on this important subject.

"After these, and several more general instructions of a similar character, the author gives a very good Commentary on the Creed, the Sacraments, the Commandments, and the deadly sins. The little tract ends with a few words of instruction to priests as to the manner of saying Mass and of giving Holy Communion to the sick."

It would be unpardonable to omit Chaucer's beautiful description of the "Parson of a Town," as an illustration of a good mediæval parish priest: [1]—

"A good man was there of religioun,
That was a pooré parson of a town,
But rich he was of holy thought and work;
He was also a learned man, a clerk,
That Christe's gospel truély would teach.
His parishens devoutly would he teach.
Benign he was and wonder diligent,
And in adversity full patient.
And such he was yproved often siths.[2]
Full loath were he to cursen for his tithes,

[1] The spelling of the words is modernized to make it more readily intelligible.

[2] Since.

But rather would he given, out of doubt,
Unto his pooré parishens about
Of his offering and eke of his substance,
He could on little thing have suffisance.
Wide was his parish, and houses far asunder,
But he ne left nought for no rain nor thunder
In sickness and in mischief, to visite
The furthest in his parish, much and lite,[1]
Upon his feet, and in his hand a staff.
This noble example to his sheep he yaff,[2]
That first he wrought and afterward he taught
Out of the gospel he the wordés caught;
And this figure he added yet thereto,
That if gold rust what shall iron do?
For if a priest be foul on whom we trust,
No wonder is a lewed[3] man to rust;
Well ought a priest example for to give
By his cleanness how his sheep should live.
He set not his benefice to hire,
And left his sheep accumbered in the mire,
And ran unto London unto Saint Paule's
To seeken him a chanterie for souls,
Or with a brotherhood to be withold;
But dwelt at home and kepté well his fold,
So that the wolf ne make it not miscarry;
He was a shepherd and no mercenary.
And though he holy were and virtuous,
He was to sinful men not dispiteous,[4]
Ne of his speeché dangerous nor digne,[5]
But in his teaching discreet and benign;
To drawen folk to heaven with fairéness,
By good example was his business.
But it were any person obstinate,
What so he were of high or low estate,
Him would he snubben sharply for the nones;[6]
A better priest, I trow, that no where none is
He waited after no pomp nor reverence,
Nor maked him no spiced conscience,
But Christe's lore and His apostles twelve
He taught, but first he followed it himselve.
With him there was a ploughman was his brother," &c.

[1] Great and little. [2] Gave. [3] Unlearned.
[4] Scornful. [5] Harsh and disdainful. [6] For the occasion.

CHAPTER XIX

THE REACTION

With the reign of Henry III. we reached the lowest point of the degradation of the Church of England. The Pope and King united in the most unscrupulous disregard of the religious interests of the people, and the most violent and dishonest plunder of the revenues of the Church. "The Pope and the King," says Matthew Paris, "like the shepherd and the wolf, were allied together for the destruction of the sheep."

But even in that reign one man at least was found bold enough to remonstrate against the Papal abuses, and to oppose the Papal power. Robert Grostête, a man of humble birth, had acquired a European reputation for learning and piety, and when made Bishop of Lincoln he soon became equally remarkable for his apostolic zeal and diligence in the government of his great diocese. He was the typical Church reformer of his age and country. He obtained authority from the Pope to visit the monasteries of his diocese and regulate their abuses. When the friars were first instituted, he welcomed them as helpers of the clergy in the work of evangelization, but towards the end of his life he saw that they in their turn had become powerful and ambitious orders, the rivals of both monks and parish priests, and the disturbers of the discipline of the Church; and he became their opponent. He refused to institute

foreigners or unfit persons to benefices in his diocese on the Pope's mandates, and wrote to Innocent IV. a letter on the subject in language to which the Pope was very little accustomed. There cannot, he argued, be any kind of sin so hateful, detestable, and abominable to our Lord Jesus Christ as to destroy souls by depriving them of the ministry of their pastors. To appoint foreigners who cannot speak the language of the people, or others who cannot or will not properly minister among them, is thus to deprive the people of shepherds. The power of the apostolic see is given for edification and not for destruction, and therefore it cannot lawfully order that such men be instituted into benefices. It is the duty of all faithful subjects of the apostolic see to oppose such unlawful acts; and therefore, he says, "by virtue of the obedience and fidelity due from him to the holy father, and in all filial affection and obedience, he must refuse to obey, and resist and oppose the orders contained in his Holiness's letters, because they most evidently tend to that which is a most abominable sin against our Lord Jesus Christ, and to what is most pernicious to the human race, and are altogether opposed to the sanctity of the apostolic see, and are contrary to the Catholic faith." The Pope was enraged at such a reply, but those about him pointed out that the bishop was held in such estimation throughout England and France, that it would not be wise to take any violent measures against him: popular sympathy would be with the bishop and against the Pope.

Bishop Grostête, the reformer of Church abuses, was, as is natural, the friend of Simon de Montfort, the reformer of the political abuses under which the kingdom groaned. When the barons had obtained the power of government in the latter part of Henry's reign, Matthew

Paris says that they seriously thought of throwing off the Roman yoke. They did order the wardens of the Cinque Ports to seize all documents coming from Rome, and made prize of some hundreds of mandates and provisions.

With the reign of Edward I. commenced a course of steady opposition to the claims of Rome on the part of the kings and parliaments, which continually thrust back its usurpation, until the movement culminated in the re-assertion of the freedom of the Church of England in the 16th century. Edward I. made a law against provisors, which, however, was not consistently observed till the reign of Edward III. In the time of the former prince, the people, by their representatives, were encouraged by him to make the Pope acquainted with the feeling of the nation on the Papal claims. It was on the occasion of the defeat of the Scots at the battle of Falkirk. The Scots in their distress appealed to the Pope, Boniface VIII., for protection; who thereupon claimed the sovereignty of Scotland as belonging to the holy see, commanded Edward to desist from warlike acts against it; and summoned him to appear and plead his claims before the Pope. The king at once laid the Pope's letter before his Parliament, then sitting at Lincoln: who replied in very firm language that the kingdom of Scotland had never belonged, as to temporals, to the Church of Rome; that the kings of England had never appeared before any ecclesiastical or secular judge in respect of any territories or temporal jurisdictions belonging to them; that the king would not submit to his Holiness's sentence with respect to his sovereignty over the kingdom of Scotland, or, indeed, in any other temporal matter whatsoever; that the king would not send any embassy on the subject, which would be contrary to

the dignity of the Crown and the liberties of the kingdom, which they were resolved to defend to the utmost of their power.

One of the great practical grievances of which England had to complain was the taking of vast sums of money out of the country to enrich the Papal court. Church property was in theory exempt from taxation; in fact, from the beginning of the reign of Henry III., the clergy in convocation taxed themselves in the shape of subsidies to the Crown, and when, in obedience to a recent Papal bull, they refused to pay a tax to Edward I., he outlawed them, and so compelled them to purchase his protection. But the theory that the Church did not pay taxes to the State, laid it open to be taxed by the head of the Church, and bishops and clergy, abbots and convents, were taxed by the Pope in various ways, regular and irregular. Every benefice, from the highest to the lowest, paid a fine (first-fruits) to the Pope on coming into the hands of a new incumbent, just as a secular fief paid a relief to the feudal lord. The bishops and abbots paid large fees also on their confirmation. The Pope also occasionally demanded irregular subsidies from the clergy. The appeals which were carried from the ecclesiastical courts to Rome were another source of considerable revenue. It has already been stated that the court of Rome drew from England in the middle of the 13th century sixty or seventy thousand marks a year, a sum far exceeding the royal revenue.

In the reign of Edward III. the Papacy had fallen into greater disrepute, and the opposition to it in England was still more pronounced. In 1350 the Statute of Provisors put an end to the Pope's infringement of the rights of patrons. In 1353 appeals to Rome were forbidden under pain of outlawry. In 1367 the king refused

any longer to pay the tribute with which King John had disgraced the kingdom. In 1374 an inquiry was again instituted into the number and value of the benefices then occupied by Frenchmen and Italians and other aliens. In the following year an embassy was sent to the Pope to complain of the abuses, and Wiclif was one of the commissioners. In 1376, Parliament met and drew up a remonstrance, which they presented to the king. They complained, in exaggerated language, that the usurpations of the Popes were the cause of all the plagues, injuries, famine, and poverty of the realm; were more destructive to it than all the wars; and were the reason why it contained not a third of the inhabitants and commodities it formerly possessed; that the Pope's collector had a house in London with a staff of officials and clerks, as if it were one of the king's great courts, transporting yearly to the Pope 20,000 marks or more; and that the taxes paid to the Pope exceeded five times those which were paid to the king. They enumerated three English deaneries, four archdeaconries, and two prebends held by cardinals in Rome, besides others of the best dignities in England held by other Italians. They complained that everything was venal in that sinful city of Rome, and that even English patrons had learnt thence to practise simony without remorse. At another time Parliament speaks plainly of expelling by force the Papal authority, and so providing a remedy against oppressions which they neither could nor would any longer endure.

It was not only against these external abuses that the people were greatly set, but there was also at the same time a great movement of the religious opinion of the people in the direction of a reformation of the received doctrines of the Church. Wiclif is the representative of

this reforming movement. This "morning star of the Reformation," as he has been called, was born in Yorkshire about 1324, was educated at Oxford, where he became master of Balliol College, and afterwards doctor in divinity. From this vantage ground he promulgated opinions approximating to those of the Reformation, both against the abuses of the Roman court and the errors of the mediæval doctrines. These opinions were countenanced by some of the highest personages in the realm, and prevailed very widely among the people. His opinions, however, contained some points erroneous in theology, and some of dangerous political consequence. These errors were taken up and augmented by some of his followers, and wild heresies and socialistic notions of government and society were propagated under his name, till the conservative spirit of the country took alarm, and Lollardism fell into disrepute. The great work which Wiclif accomplished was his translation of the whole Bible into English, and its wide circulation among the people. No doubt the teaching of Wiclif is to be reckoned among the remote causes which led up to the Reformation of the 16th century; but modern historical writers affirm that it had not so lasting an influence as some writers have taken for granted. Some Bohemian students at Oxford imbibed Wiclif's views and carried them home, where they took root, and were influential in producing the Reformation there, and so had some slight reflex influence on England. But Lollardism did not last in England much beyond the beginning of the French wars, and had died out long before the English Reformation began.

The influence of these opinions, while they lasted, may be traced in two remarkable propositions which the House of Commons made in the reign of Henry IV.

In the sixth year of that king, 1404 A.D., when he asked for supplies, they presented an address, in which they proposed to the king that he should seize all the temporalities of the Church and employ them as a perpetual fund to serve the exigencies of the State. They represented that the clergy possessed a third of the lands of the kingdom, that they contributed nothing to the public burdens, and that their wealth only tended to disqualify them from performing their proper duties with zeal and efficiency. The king, however, discouraged the revolutionary proposal, and the Upper House of Parliament rejected the bill which the Commons sent up. Five years afterwards the Commons renewed its attack upon Church property. They put forth a calculation of all the ecclesiastical estates, which by their account consisted of 18,400 plough lands, bringing in a revenue of 485,000 marks a year. They proposed to divide this land among 15 new earls, 1500 knights, 6000 esquires, and 100 hospitals, besides £20,000 a year which the king might take to his own use.[1] And they insisted that the clerical functions would be better performed than at present by 15,000 parish priests paid at the rate of seven marks apiece of yearly stipend. The address was accompanied by an application for a mitigation of the statutes enacted against the Lollards, which shows from what source this proposal to deal with the Church property came. The king gave a severe reply to the Commons; and, before the end of the Parliament, a

[1] Such estimates as these, made to serve a purpose, would afford a very unsafe authority for the actual state of Church property at the period. It may be convenient to note here two other estimates of the value of Church property at different periods. The Taxation of Pope Nicholas is the result of careful and minute official inquiry in 1294 A.D., and the *Valor Ecclesiasticus* of a similar inquiry in 1535 A.D.

Lollard was burnt to prove that the king was in earnest in his maintenance of the constitution.

The only other legislative act we need mention as a step in the reaction against the Papal usurpation is the Statute of Præmunire, passed in the reign of Richard II., 1383 A.D., which forbade the bringing of any Papal bulls, processes, or excommunications into the kingdom without the king's licence, under forfeiture of goods and perpetual imprisonment. The Church and nation were thus at length brought again into much the same relation to the Roman see as that in which William I. and Lanfranc had placed them at the Conquest.

CHAPTER XX

THE REFORMATION: THE REPUDIATION OF THE PAPAL SUPREMACY

We have seen in the previous chapters how in course of ages the primitive constitution of the Church had been overthrown, and the rights of bishops, clergy, and people violated, by the usurpations of the court of Rome; how false doctrines had been introduced, superstitious practices had crept in, and morality had deteriorated. The need of a reformation of religion had long been recognized by prelates and clergy, no less than by the laity. The court of Rome being the great upholder of all these abuses, a general council of the Church was at first looked to as the only means of effecting a reformation, and the Councils of Constance and of Basle in the 15th century were great endeavours of the Church to effect the needed reforms. The Council of Constance aimed at objects very similar to those of the old Catholic movement in Germany at the present day; the authority of the Pope was dealt with in the most summary manner, and distinctly subordinated to that of the council; and yet, with all its good cause and powerful support, the council utterly failed in its main objects. The concentrated strength of the Roman court, its tenacity, its skilful intrigues, triumphed at length over the forces of its assailants, divided by national jealousies, afraid to strike at the root of the Papal usurpations, and unsupported by any deep religious enthusiasm among the

masses of the people, and the authority of the Pope reasserted itself when the first impulse of reform had spent its force.

The Roman court having succeeded in frustrating these attempts at a general reform, national Churches at length began to act for themselves. The King of France summoned a great assembly of the nobility, clergy, and others, who determined to adopt the reforming decrees of the Council of Basle. The Emperor of Germany and the Imperial Diet took a similar course. Cardinal Ximenes, the Minister of Spain, introduced many reforms there; and Cardinal Wolsey began to take some steps towards a correction of abuses in England.

Wolsey, the great minister of Henry VIII., has not had justice done to his character as a statesman, and to his intentions as a reformer. The fact that he was a cardinal misleads the popular mind into the idea that he must have been a creature of the Papal court. This was not so. We have seen that for many generations nearly all who entered into the civil service of the State were nominally clerics, and had been rewarded with Church preferment in lieu of salaries. The Church was then, as the law is now, the high-road to preferment in the civil service of the State. A certain number of cardinalates were appropriated by precedent to each of the great kingdoms of Europe. When a cardinalate fell vacant the king sometimes asked for it as a reward for the great minister, instead of the great Churchman, of the time. So Ximenes in Spain, Richelieu in France, Beaton in Scotland, and Wolsey in England, received this blue riband of their profession. Wolsey was the greatest statesman of his time; he exercised a great power in England, and possessed a vast influence throughout Europe. He certainly saw the necessity of a religious

reformation, and worked towards it. He sought power from the Pope to visit and reform the religious houses and reduce them in number. Having obtained it he used it to suppress a number of the smaller ones, and devoted part of their property to the founding of a new college at Oxford, with a great public school at Ipswich as a feeder to it (like Winchester School and New College at Oxford, and Eton and King's College at Cambridge), by which he sought to encourage the revival of classical learning in England. He also founded professorships at Oxford to teach the new learning, a further step towards making the universities equal to the demands of the time. He proposed to devote another part of the property of the suppressed monasteries to the founding of some new bishoprics, thus pruning the exuberance of the monastic system, and promoting the growth and improvement of the parochial system. He refused to countenance the persecution of those who had taken up new opinions in religion, and dealt so leniently with those who were brought before him on charges of heresy, that it became one of the items of accusation subsequently brought against him. He even contemplated the step of throwing off the Papal supremacy and the assertion of the independence of national Churches.[1] In short, says a modern writer, Wolsey was "the most honest, the noblest, and the

[1] In a letter to the king, Henry VIII., written in 1527, he suggested that a continuance of the Roman policy would end in this, that the Churches of England and France should decline from the obedience of the Pope, to his perpetual rebuke and ignominy. And at a subsequent period, during the progress of the divorce cause, Wolsey, in a despatch to Gardiner, who was the ambassador at Rome, bids him state to the Pope that, if he should take some step which he was supposed to contemplate, he would thereby so irritate the king and all the nobles of this realm, that undoubtedly they would decline from the obedience of the apostolic see, and consequently all other realms would do the same.

wisest of the Church reformers." The king was less disposed to reform than his minister. He had been educated (while his elder brother lived) with a view to the Church, and was fond of theological studies. He entered into the questions which Luther had raised with so much zeal as to write a reply to him, and in gratitude the Pope conferred on him the title of Defender of the Faith, which the sovereigns of England still bear. But the question of the divorce led the king to adopt the Reformation policy.

Henry VII. had married his eldest son Arthur to Catherine, daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, the sovereigns of Castile and Arragon. The bride was 18, the bridegroom only 15. Four months afterwards the prince died, and Catherine asserted publicly and solemnly, when her divorce was agitated, that her first marriage was never consummated. The politic king, in order not to forfeit the advantages of this alliance, proceeded to arrange a marriage between Catherine and his second son Henry, now Prince of Wales. The Pope, Julius II., gave a dispensation, and Henry, at the age of 18, was married to Catherine, then 26 years of age. In the early years of the king's reign the marriage was a happy one, except that it brought no male heir to the throne. But after a time the discrepancy of age began to tell. In 1518 Henry was only 27, and one of the handsomest men of his time, and had fallen into libertine habits; Catherine was already 35, and older than her years, with health broken, beauty faded, and becoming somewhat austere in her religious practices. The idea of a divorce seems to have arisen in 1526. In the course of some negotiations for a marriage of the Princess Mary, the only surviving child of Henry and Catherine, with one of the sons of the King of France, the French

envoy raised the objection that the Pope had exceeded his powers in granting a dispensation for the marriage of Henry to Catherine, for that such a union was contrary not only to the law of the Church but also to the law of God, from which the Pope could give no dispensation; therefore the marriage was null *ab initio*, and the Princess Mary illegitimate. The king stated afterwards that this incident had excited his conscientious scruples; that he feared that it was because the marriage was unlawful that six out of the seven children born of it had died, and that it had given no heir male to the Crown. Cardinal Pole (a relative of the king) at a later date told the king, as if it was a fact known to them both, that Anne Boleyn, with whom the king was smitten, suggested the idea of a divorce. In the following year the king opened negotiations with the Pope on the subject of a divorce. It is enough here to say that Wolsey was secretly opposed to the measure, and that to the king's displeasure on that account, fanned by Anne Boleyn's influence, the fall of the great statesman is to be attributed. He was disgraced in 1529, and died in the following year, 1530.

The principal charge brought against Wolsey, in order to give legal colour to his ruin and plunder, was that he had transgressed against the statute of Richard II. by acting as legate, and so had incurred the penalty of "præmunire." It was a mere pretext, and became more absurd when the words of the Act, which imposed forfeiture also on all "abettors, fautors, and councillors," were construed to include all the clergy, and ultimately all the laity, of the land. It was a very serious jest to the Cardinal, who was disgraced and ruined; and to the clergy, who were condemned to pay a fine of about £120,000, or about £1,500,000 of modern money. We

mention it because of the new title of "Supreme Head of the Church" which the king caused to be attributed to him in the draft preamble of the Act of Convocation, by which the money was voted. It serves to show that the clergy refused to co-operate with the king in any steps which were theologically unsound. Convocation submitted to be plundered of its money by the king, but refused to attribute this title to him, on the ground that terms of so general a nature might hereafter be wrested to imply a spiritual as well as a temporal headship. The king gave way to the arguments used so far as to consent to the insertion of the words supreme head *after God;* but that also was capable of being interpreted as implying a spiritual headship, and the clergy stood out against it. Finally, it was agreed that the words should run, *so far as the law of Christ will allow—caput supremum quantum per Christi legem licet.* This was stated by the king in writing, and understood by the Church to mean, that the clergy were not answerable to their sovereign in respect to their sacerdotal functions, but were subject to him in regard to homage and allegiance, their temporal estates, and their submission to the laws for the punishment of crime. The title was dropped after being in use about twenty-five years, and the phrase which now expresses the royal supremacy is "supreme governor in these his realms, over all persons, and in all causes as well ecclesiastical as temporal."[1]

The divorce cause dragged on its weary length for years, occupying the attention of all Europe, the king urging the Pope to pronounce sentence in his favour, the Pope procrastinating, probably in the hope that Catherine might die and relieve all parties from a difficult situation. At this point of the history Cranmer

[1] Canon lv., Bidding Prayer.

comes upon the stage. Thomas Cranmer was born at Aslackton, in Notts, in 1484. He was of gentle blood. At 14 his mother, now a widow, sent him to Cambridge, where in due course he took the usual degrees and became a Fellow of Jesus College about 1510. We hear nothing more of him till 1525, when, having attained his forty-first year, he vacated his Fellowship by marriage. Erasmus had meantime been teaching Greek at Cambridge, while at Wittemberg Luther had startled the world by his denunciations of the shameful traffic in indulgences, and had publicly burnt the Papal bull which condemned him as a heretic. Cranmer, after the death of his wife, within his year of grace, reclaimed and was allowed his Fellowship. He was of sufficient reputation to have a canonry in Wolsey's new college, Cardinal College, Oxford, offered him; but he declined it, and remained at Cambridge, devoted to academical pursuits. His greatness is said to have sprung out of the following occurrence. An outbreak of the plague, called the sweating sickness, at Cambridge in the year 1528, drove him to take refuge with two of his pupils at the house of their father, Mr. Cressy, at Waltham Abbey. This visit was the turning point in his career. While he was living at Waltham, King Henry passed the night at Tittenhanger. Two of his train, Gardiner and Fox, were billeted on Mr. Cressy, and at supper the discourse turned on the great topic which was the subject of interest throughout Europe, the king's divorce. Cranmer's conversation made an impression on his new acquaintances. He suggested that all canonists were agreed that the Pope could not dispense from God's law, but only from ecclesiastical law; and that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was forbidden by God's law; if, therefore, the canonists should decide

that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was forbidden by God's law, and if the English ecclesiastical courts should decide that Arthur and Catherine were married, then it followed that Henry's marriage was no marriage; and the proper course was not to ask the Pope for a divorce or a dispensation, but to assume that the marriage was originally null and void, and the king a bachelor, at liberty to marry without any dispensation. This view of the matter was soon after reported to Henry; who, in his turn, was so struck with it that in his blunt way he exclaimed, "This fellow has got the right sow by the ear; bring him here." Cranmer accordingly was brought to the king, and from that day entered into the king's service. By the king's order he wrote a work on the subject of the marriage, and was employed in the negotiations at Rome. He had a special mission to Charles V., and to the Papal Commissioners. He was one of those sent to obtain the opinions of the foreign universities, and was thus brought into contact with Erasmus, Melanchthon, and Bucer, and married the niece of Osiander as his second wife. During his absence the see of Canterbury fell vacant by the death of Warham, and the king determined that Cranmer should be his successor. He was consecrated March 30th, 1533. Meantime, without waiting for the divorce, Henry, acting on Cranmer's view that he was a bachelor, was privately married to Anne Boleyn, it was said in Jan. 1533, and Elizabeth was born in September of the same year.

In May of that year the new archbishop opened his court, with the royal licence, for the trial of the divorce between the king and queen. Catherine, refusing to acknowledge his jurisdiction, was pronounced contumacious, and Cranmer proceeded to give sentence to the effect that, having examined all the evidence that

had been given, the opinions of the universities, the decision of Convocation, and all other documents throwing light on the case, he had found it his duty to pronounce a final decree and sentence, to the effect that the marriage was null and invalid from the beginning. This was a bold step, since it virtually set aside the Pope's supremacy, and assumed for the national ecclesiastical courts the right to decide the cause which had so long been before the Roman court. The king and the archbishop, in anticipation of the action of the Pope, appealed to a general council.

When the news reached Rome the Pope at once issued a brief, declaring Cranmer's sentence null and void, on the ground that the cause was pending before the Pope himself, and therefore was beyond the jurisdiction of any other court; and on March 24 of the following year, 1534, he gave final sentence in the long-pending cause, declaring that the marriage of Henry and Catherine was valid, and commanding him to restore her to her rights on pain of excommunication. Thus the breach between the king and the Pope was complete, and the king was finally committed to the side of reform. But the work of reformation in England was the work of the Church itself. It was not the king who reformed an unwilling Church; it was not a secession of a party from the Church, as in Germany; it was the Church of England which, favoured by the political circumstances, reformed herself of her own will, acting in accordance with her own constitution.

Already, in 1531, the Convocation, consisting of Warham and all the old bishops and clergy, had petitioned the king to relieve the clergy of the payment of annates (first-fruits) to the Pope; proposing to pay five per cent. of the annates by way of fee to the Papal court for the

issue of the Papal bulls, &c., on admission to benefices; and in case of the Pope's refusal, they prayed that the obedience of England might be withdrawn from the see of Rome. To strengthen the king's hand in the negotiation with Rome, a provisional Act of Parliament was passed, to be assented to and published at the king's discretion, enacting that all such payments should cease, that five per cent. on the annual value of the see should be paid to the Pope for the bulls of consecration to a bishopric, and that if the Pope should refuse to grant his bulls, bishops should be consecrated by the archbishop of the province and other bishops; and if the Pope should proceed to excommunication and interdict, his sentence to that effect should be disregarded. This amounted to a declaration, on the part of the Church and State of England, that the Church of England was henceforth independent of the Roman see: still willing to pay a certain customary deference to the see which had so long been the premier see of the Western Church, but prepared to disregard its assumptions of greater power.

Two years afterwards, 1534, this provisional Act was published, and followed up by another Act (25 Hen. VIII., cap. 20), which did away with all reference to the Pope, and all interference on his part in the appointment of bishops, and established the mode of appointing and consecrating them which still continues in force.

In the same year another Act for "restraining appeals" was passed to forbid any subjects of the English Crown from carrying appeals from the English ecclesiastical courts to the court of Rome: a step which on sound Church principles the sovereign had the right to take, and was justified under the circumstances in taking. It was followed up by the Act 25 Hen. VIII., cap. 21,

enacting that neither the sovereign nor the subjects of this realm should hereafter apply to Rome for any dispensations, grants, faculties, or other writings of any kind whatever, but that all such applications should be made to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

In the same year the convocations of the clergy and the universities formally indorsed as theologically correct what the sovereign had thus done in denying the Pope's supremacy. The Convocation of Canterbury declared on March 31, 1534, and that of York on May 5, 1534, "that the Bishop of Rome has no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in this kingdom of England than any other foreign bishop." There seems to have been no difficulty in obtaining the assent of the clergy generally, even in the monasteries, to this final repudiation of the Papal supremacy, and the bishops were zealous in preaching it to the people at large. We may sum up this reformation of the constitutional abuses which had grown up in the mediæval Church thus: the Church and nation had determined that no taxes should be paid to the see of Rome; that the Pope should have no judicial authority in England; that his assumed rights of patronage to bishoprics and other benefices should be abolished; that his licence and authorization should not be required for any ecclesiastical appointments; and that he should have no spiritual power in England. The spiritual jurisdiction which the Pope had usurped reverted of right to the episcopate of the Church of England. England repudiated the Papal supremacy in 1534. The Pope published his sentence of excommunication against Henry in 1538.

CHAPTER XXI

THE REFORMATION: SUPPRESSION OF THE REGULAR CLERGY AND DISSOLUTION OF THE MONASTERIES

In the earlier centuries of the mediæval period the monastic system was, in God's hands, the most powerful agency for preaching the Gospel and establishing the Church of Christ among the barbarous nations of Europe; and in the later centuries the monasteries were the centres of civilization, learning, and art, as well as of religion. But by the 15th century circumstances had altered. We need not believe the stories of the unscrupulous agents whom Cromwell sent as commissioners to find a case against the monasteries; but however respectable these wealthy, learned, and religious communities may have been, they were no longer the kind of agency which the circumstances of the Church and kingdom needed; and it was no doubt a proper part of a well-considered reformation of the Church to revise and remodel this portion of the ecclesiastical establishment.

Wolsey had begun it when he appropriated several of the smaller houses to the founding of his new college in Oxford, and the new grammar school in connection with it at Ipswich. It would have been well to continue the policy thus begun; to have restored tithes to their parishes, or given them to other parishes where they were needed, and to have converted a considerable proportion of the monastic property into such foundations for religion, learning, and charity as were needed under

the changed circumstances of the Church and nation. The movement was begun with the profession of such an intention on the part of the king. Latimer desired to see some of the monasteries (at least one in each county) retained as places of holy retirement; Cranmer was anxious that many of them should be turned into colleges. The king himself made in his own hand a memorandum of some which he proposed to convert into cathedrals of new sees.[1] But Cromwell was the king's chief agent in this part of the Reformation, and very possibly it is to him that we owe the policy which was actually adopted. This was nothing less than to suppress altogether the two great bodies of the regular clergy, that is, the monks and the friars; to confiscate their possessions; and to use the lands and money thus gained in the foundation of a new nobility, and in the relief of the king's impoverished exchequer.

The first Act of Suppression, in 1535, dealt with the smaller houses only. It stated in the preamble that

[1] These were Waltham for Essex; St. Albans for Hertford; another for Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire out of the monasteries of Dunstable, Newenham, and Elstow; another for Oxfordshire and Berkshire out of the rents of Oseney and Thame; one for Northampton and Huntingdon out of Peterborough; one for Middlesex out of Westminster; one for Leicester and Rutland out of Leicester; one for Gloucestershire out of St. Peter's in Gloucester; one for Lancashire out of Fountains and the Archdeaconry of Richmond; one for Suffolk out of Edmundsbury; one for Stafford and Salop out of Shrewsbury; one for Nottingham and Derby out of Welbeck, Worksop, and Thurgarton; and one for Cornwall out of the rents of Launceston, Bodmin, and Tywardreth. Over these he wrote "Bishoprics to be made;" and in another part of the same paper he wrote "Places to be altered into colleges and schools," but mentions only Burton-upon-Trent. Neither Chester nor Bristol are mentioned, though sees were afterwards founded in them. The king, says Bishop Burnet, had formed a great design of endowing many sees and making many other noble foundations; yet the change that was made in the councils and ministry before this took effect was so great, that only a small part was accomplished of that which the king now intended.

there were great irregularities in them, and that it was desirable that such small houses should be utterly suppressed, and the religious persons therein committed to "the great solemn monasteries of this realm, wherein (thanks be to God) religion is right well kept and observed," and which it was alleged were "destitute of such full number of religious persons as they ought and may keep." In fact, all monks under twenty-five years old were dismissed, others encouraged to go, and many by hardships driven away. The Act did not pass the House of Commons without difficulty. "When the bill," says Sir H. Spelman, "had stuck long in the Lower House, and could get no passage, the king commanded the Commons to attend him in the forenoon in his gallery, where he let them wait till late in the afternoon, and then, coming out of his chamber, walking a turn or two amongst them, and looking angrily on them, first on one side and then on the other, at last, 'I hear,' saith he, 'that my bill will not pass; but I will have it pass, or I will have some of your heads,' and without other rhetoric or persuasion returned to his chamber. Enough was said; the bill was passed, and all was given him as he desired."

The king then proceeded to attack the greater monasteries. He did not in a straightforward way obtain an Act for their suppression, but he proceeded by bribery and by threats, by false accusations and by legal crimes, to obtain the surrender and forfeiture of individual houses. Many abbots yielded to their fate and surrendered their houses. In some cases an abbot who was too conscientious to surrender his abbey was induced to resign his office, and a more compliant successor was appointed. Some were accused of crimes and executed, and so got rid of.

The case of the Abbot of Glastonbury may be briefly

given as an example of the latter mode of procedure. The abbey was reckoned the oldest in England, and was a wealthy and magnificent establishment. The abbot, a member of the House of Lords, and with considerable revenues, was a great prelate. He was then about eighty years of age, and had been long known for his piety and munificence. Three hundred sons of the gentry lived in the monastery for education, just as they are now sent to a public school; besides other youths of lower rank, who were gratuitously educated at the monastery, and then supported at Oxford and Cambridge. As many as 500 of the county gentry sometimes sat down at table in the abbot's hall; and twice a week crowds of the poor were fed at his gate. Cromwell's visitors came suddenly to Glastonbury at ten o'clock one morning, at the end of September, 1539, and found that the abbot was at one of his manors a mile distant. Thither they hurried, and finding the old prelate in his study, began to examine him. They brought him back to the abbey, and, when he had gone to bed at night, searched his study for matter of accusation against him. They found, among other things, a writing containing arguments against the divorce —it was now eight years since the divorce had taken place—and they found in a printed book—perhaps the 'Golden Legend'—a life of Thomas Becket, not obliterated, as the king had ordered; but they found no letters of any importance. Out of this old paper on the divorce and this life of Becket in some printed book or other, they made a charge of treason, and sent the abbot up to London to the Tower. Then they began to collect the plate and valuables of the monastery; and hunted out both money, plate, and jewels from the places where they had been concealed from the rapacity of the visitors; they suspected that more was hidden which they could

not find. A private memorandum of Cromwell's still remains relating to the matter. "Item, certain persons to be sent to the Tower for the further examination of the Abbot of Glaston. Item, the Abbot of Glaston to be tried at Glaston, and also to be executed there with his accomplices." So the aged prelate was taken to Wells to be tried, it having been already arranged before his trial that he was "to be executed with his accomplices." At Wells, when brought into court, he went to take his seat among the noblemen and gentlemen he found assembled there, and when told to take his place at the bar to answer a charge of high treason, he asked his attendant, "What does it all mean?" He answered that they were trying to terrify him into submission. He was condemned, and next day was taken in his horse-litter to Glastonbury. It was only when a priest came to offer him the last consolations of religion that he realized that he was really to be put to death, and asked to be allowed a few hours to take leave of his monks and prepare for his end. The delay was refused. The old man was taken from his litter and placed on a hurdle, upon which he was dragged through the town to the top of the Tor, the hill which overlooks the monastery, and there executed. Two of his monks, condemned for the robbery of Glastonbury Church (*i. e.* probably for assisting to hide some of its possessions from the royal robber), were "the accomplices" executed with him. His head was placed over the gate of his own abbey, and his members were exposed at the four principal towns of the county. Besides the Abbot of Glastonbury, the Abbots of Fountains, Jervaulx, Barlings, Reading, Sawley, Whalley, Woburne, and Colchester, and the Prior of Bridlington, were executed.

In 1540 the second Act of Suppression was passed,

which recited that sundry abbots, &c., "of their free and voluntary minds, without constraint or compulsion, had resigned and granted to the king all their houses, estates, and privileges;" and enacted that the king should hold, possess, and enjoy them, and all which should hereafter be so resigned.

In the following year an Act of Parliament suppressed the Order of St. John of Jerusalem; the prior fell down and died as he came out of the gateway of their chief house at Clerkenwell. The king was not content with this spoliation. Five years after the Act for the dissolution of the monasteries, another Act was passed which placed at the mercy of the king the endowments of the universities, of all colleges of secular priests, and of all chantries. Commissioners were appointed to take possession; but this last act of spoliation was arrested by the king's death.

What became of the plunder? All the money, plate, jewels, &c., were paid over to the king. Six new bishoprics[1] were created out of six of the suppressed houses. Many of the estates were sold, and the money went into the king's coffers. But the bulk of the estates was given to the nobility, and several new families of nobles were founded out of them. Cromwell appropriated seven priories; his nephew, Sir Richard Cromwell, also seven abbeys and priories. Lord Chancellor Audley founded a great family on eight abbeys and priories. Lord Clinton received thirteen. Lord Russell founded the Bedford earldom out of three rich abbeys. Lord Parr founded the marquisate of Northampton out of

[1] Viz., Westminster, Oxford, Chester, Gloucester, Bristol, and Peterborough. Some were allowed to remain as Collegiate churches, as Beverly, Southwell, Manchester, and Wolverhampton. St. Bartholomew and St. Thomas's Hospitals were preserved at the intercession of Sir T. Gresham.

four priories. The Duke of Norfolk received thirteen abbeys, nunneries, and colleges; some of them were restored to him as descendant or representative of the original founders. Perhaps on a similar claim, the Duke of Somerset received thirteen houses. Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, the king's brother-in-law, became the proprietor of thirty monasteries. The monks were turned out; in several cases the dispossessed abbots and priors became the new bishops and deans. Some who were priests were provided for in benefices or as parish chaplains, some with pensions, some were turned adrift to earn their living as best they could, with a clerk's gown given them in place of their monk's habit, and 40*s.* for present maintenance. The monastic churches were rifled of all their contents; the lead taken off the roofs, the roofs themselves hurled to the ground, the windows broken, and the glorious ruins left to decay. The domestic buildings were either altered and adapted for the residence of the new possessor, or they were pulled down and the materials used to build him a mansion-house. The libraries were despoiled; shiploads of valuable books were sent for sale to the Continent, and a still greater number torn up and used for every purpose to which vellum and paper could be applied. The palls, hangings, and vestments were sold to the public, and in many cases were used for hangings for halls and chambers, for table-covers and bed-curtains, or cut up for vests and petticoats. The Reformation was necessary and beneficial; but the violence and rapine by which it was marred were most lamentable and wicked; they have done much to discredit the Reformation itself in the eyes of all Christendom, and have entailed miseries upon England from which we are all suffering bitterly to this hour.

CHAPTER XXII

THE DOCTRINAL REFORMATION

THE reformation of doctrine was commenced by Convocation in 1536. Men's minds were much disturbed; the doctrines which were afloat on the Continent, from those of Luther to those of the Anabaptists, were promulgated and discussed here in England; and it was desirable that some steps should be taken by the reformers to guide men through the confusion. Accordingly, the Convocation drew up Ten Articles of Religion, which were subscribed by the clergy and issued under the king's authority, as a formal exposition of the reformed doctrine.

The articles are too voluminous to be quoted at length. Five of them relate to doctrines and five to ceremonies. The first lays down the Bible and the three Creeds as the basis of doctrine, and says that all contrary opinions, as condemned by the first four holy councils, are to be refused and condemned. The second sets forth the doctrine of baptism as we still hold it, with this exception, that it pronounces on the fate of infants dying unbaptized, and says that they cannot be saved. The third is on the sacrament of penance, and asserts that it is necessary to the forgiveness of deadly sin committed after baptism. The fourth, on the sacrament of the altar, teaches the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ corporally and really under the form and figure of bread and wine, but does not teach transubstantiation.

In the fifth, justification by faith is taught, viz., that "the only mercy and grace of the Father, promised freely unto us for His Son's sake Jesus Christ, and the merits of His blood and passion," are "the only sufficient and worthy causes thereof." In the sixth the use of images, to remind the worshipper and stir up his mind to devotion, is allowed, but it is explained that no worship is intended to them, but only to God. The seventh and eighth, on the honouring of saints and the praying to saints, allows them to be had in reverence and even to be invoked, and contents itself with declaring against certain popular abuses. The ninth, on certain ceremonies, as the use of holy bread, holy water, candles at Candlemas, and palms on Palm Sunday, allows them as significant memorials, and explains them. The tenth, on purgatory, allows prayers for the dead, but repudiates the Roman idea of purgatory and practices connected with it, such as pardons.

These articles were followed up shortly after by a book called 'The Institution (*i. e.* Instruction) of a Christian Man,' commonly called the Bishop's Book. This was an admirably conceived work, giving with great clearness and in an uncontroversial and devout tone the belief of the Church as agreed on, after much discussion, by all schools of English divines of that period of the Reformation. This book, put forth in 1537, marks the extent to which the reform reached in this reign.

Two years afterwards (1539), under the king's influence, Parliament passed the reactionary Act of the Six Articles, which maintained (1) transubstantiation; (2) communion in one kind; (3) celibacy of the priesthood; (4) vows of chastity to be kept; (5) private masses agreeable to God's law; (6) auricular confession expedient and necessary. But not content with this reactionary

statement of doctrine, the Act proceeded to enact cruel penalties upon offenders against it. Offenders against the first article were to be adjudged heretics and burnt, and forfeit their goods as in cases of high treason; offenders against the other five to suffer and forfeit as in cases of felony. The Act caused a great outcry, and was popularly called "the whip with six strings." But it is doubtful whether it really did the mischief it was capable of doing. There are no cases on record of prosecutions under it during the few remaining years of Henry's reign, and it was repealed in the first year of Edward VI., and never revived. A further indication that the Reformation did not really recede to the standard of this Act of Parliament is that in 1543 a revised edition of the 'Institution' was put forth, under the title, 'The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man,' commonly called the King's Book, which recedes a little from the standard of reform contained in the Ten Articles, but not so far as to bring it into conformity with the reactionary Act of the Six Articles.

During the remainder of Henry's reign there were no further direct dealings with doctrinal standards. But the reformed doctrines were spreading continually among the people, and their spread was helped by the concurrent reforms in Divine worship, and by the increasing knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; two subjects which will be most conveniently dealt with in separate paragraphs.

As early as 1516, in the time of Warham and Wolsey, a reformed edition of the Breviary (answering to the Common Prayer Book) had been published; especially, the Scripture Lessons were lengthened, and the whole Bible was arranged to be read in order without omission. The Convocation of 1542-43 passed a canon ordering that every Sunday and holy day, in morning and evening

service, a chapter of the Bible should be read in English. The Archbishop of York had in 1536 ordered that the Gospel and Epistle should be read in English, and that priests who were qualified to do so should give an exposition of one or both. But the great step taken by this Convocation, which led to the thorough revision of the ancient Service Books, and ultimately to the production of our present Book of Common Prayer, was the appointment of a committee for the purpose. The Litany was the service best known to, and best liked by, the people; they had had it translated into English in their Primers for a century and a half; it presented few doctrinal difficulties; it only needed to have some objectionable portions omitted. Accordingly the committee took this in hand at once, and the revised Litany, much as we possess it, received the sanction of Convocation in March, 1543-44, and was promulgated by the Crown on June 11, 1544. In 1548 was published a form written by Cranmer "for the alteration of the Mass into a Communion." It consisted of the addition in English of that part of the present service which begins "Ye that do truly," the Confession, Absolution, Comfortable Words, Prayer of humble access, the first half of the sentences of Administration, and the concluding "the peace of God . . . our Lord." The committee continued its labours, but the results were not ripe for publication, or the king delayed their promulgation, and they did not appear till the reign of Edward VI.

There is a good deal of popular misapprehension about the way in which the Bible was regarded in the Middle Ages. Some people think that it was very little read, even by the clergy, whereas the fact is that the sermons of the mediæval preachers are more full of Scripture quotations and allusions than any sermons in

these days; and the writers on other subjects are so full of scriptural allusion that it is evident their minds were saturated with scriptural diction, which they used as commonly, and sometimes with as great an absence of good taste, as a Puritan of the Commonwealth. Another common error is that the clergy were unwilling that the laity should read the Bible for themselves, and carefully kept it in an unknown tongue, that the people might not be able to read it. The truth is that most people who could read at all could read Latin, and would certainly prefer to read the authorized Vulgate to any vernacular version. But it is also true that translations into the vernacular were made. We have seen in a former chapter that there were Saxon versions of different books. And we have the authority of Sir Thomas More for saying that "the whole Bible was long before Wiclif's days, by virtuous and well-learned men, translated into the English tongue, and by good and godly people with devotion and soberness well and reverently read." Speaking of the constitution of Archbishop Arundel, 1408, forbidding the reading of Wiclif's translation of the Bible, or any other translations unless approved by the bishop of the diocese, or if necessary by a provincial council, he says "this order neither forbad the translations to be read that were done of old before Wiclif's days, nor condemned his because it was new, but because it was naught" (bad). Again, on another occasion he says, "The clergy keep no Bibles from the laity but such translations as be either not yet approved for good, or such as be already reproved for naught, as Wiclif's was. For as for old ones that were before Wiclif's days, they remain lawful, and be in some folks' hands." "I myself have seen and can show you Bibles new and old which have been known and seen by the bishop of the diocese, and left in laymen's

hands, and women's to such as he knew for good and Catholic folk, that used it with soberness and devotion." Possibly a good deal of the misapprehension arises from the statement of a popular historian of the German Reformation, who gives a dramatic account of Luther's stumbling by accident on a Bible in the library of his convent. "One day (he had been studying two years at Erfurth, and was twenty years of age) he opened one after another several books in the library in order to become acquainted with their authors. A volume he opens in its turn arrests his attention. He has seen nothing like it to this moment. He reads the title—it is a Bible! a rare book, unknown in those days. His interest is excited to a high degree; he is overcome with wonder at finding more in the volume than those fragments of the Gospels and Epistles which the Church had selected to be read in the temples every Sunday throughout the year. Till then he had supposed these constituted the entire Word of God; and now behold how many chapters, how many books, of which he had not before had a notion." (D'Aubigné's 'Reformation.') Dr. Maitland has conclusively disposed of this story by showing that, "to say nothing of *parts* of the Bible or of books whose *place* is uncertain, we know of at least *twenty* different *editions* of the *whole* Latin Bible, *printed in Germany* only, before Luther was born." Neither is it true that mediæval theologians appealed to the Church, and not to the Scriptures, as the authority for their doctrines. The appeal was ultimately to Scripture, but to Scripture rightly interpreted. Certain of the ancient Fathers, who were universally acknowledged to have been eminently learned and judicious, were much looked up to as authorities on the right interpretation of Scripture. Chrysostom and Augustine were quoted then just as

Luther and Melanchthon, or Calvin, or Cranmer, in later times. When a controversy disturbed the peace of the Church, and it seemed desirable to have it settled, it is true that the Church claimed the right to decide what Scripture, rightly interpreted, said on the question. The principle is laid down clearly in the famous passage of Vincent of Lerins: "The Bible is perfect and sufficient of itself for the truth of the Catholic faith, and the whole Church cannot make one article of faith, although it may be taken as a necessary witness of the same, without these three conditions—that the thing which we would establish thereby hath been believed in all places, always, and by all the faithful (*ubique, semper, ab omnibus*)." If the dispute were a local one, a diocesan or provincial synod might suffice to settle it; if it had spread over a wider surface, like the Arian controversy, it might be necessary to call a general council. No reformed Church ever laid down a proposition so manifestly absurd as that a man's faith was to be determined by what he thought the meaning of the Bible to be. The Lutheran Confession of Wurtemberg says that "we believe and confess that . . . . the Church has the right of judging of all doctrines . . . . and that the Church has the right of interpreting Scripture." Calvin admits that when a discussion concerning doctrine arises, no more fit mode of settling it can be devised than a meeting of bishops to discuss it. Cranmer, appealing to a general council, protests, "I intend to speak nothing against the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, or the authority thereof; the which authority I have in great reverence, and to whom my mind is in all things to obey;" and again, "I may err, but heretic I cannot be, forasmuch as I am ready in all things to follow the judgment of the most sacred Word of God

and of the Holy Catholic Church." And in the revision of the articles of our Church in the time of Elizabeth, under the influence of Archbishop Parker, the clause was inserted, "The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith."

The Reformers did appeal to the Bible for the truth of the principles of the Reformation, and were naturally anxious to bring it to the knowledge of the people, not for controversial purposes only, but especially for general religious instruction and devotion; and the new invention of printing enabled them to multiply copies at a cost which brought them within the reach of ordinary people. Accordingly, in 1534 the Convocation presented an address to the king, asking him to cause an authoritative translation of the Bible to be prepared. Without waiting for this, the archbishop, Cranmer, of his own authority undertook to prepare one. His secretary tells us how he proceeded: "He began with the translation of the New Testament, taking an old English translation thereof, which he divided into nine or ten parts, causing each part to be written at large on a paper, and then sent to the best learned bishops and others, to the intent that they should make a perfect correction thereof. And when they had done he required them to send back their parts so corrected unto him at Lambeth by a day limited for that purpose; and the same course in question he took with the Old Testament."

At the very time that the bishops were thus engaged, an English Bible, called Coverdale's Bible, was being printed abroad, which was published October 1535, with a dedication to the king; and it is probably this which is referred to in an injunction issued by Cromwell in the following year, which ordered that "one book of the whole Bible, of the largest volume, in English, should

be provided in every parish, and set up in some convenient place within the church, whereas the parishioners may most commodiously resort to the same and read it." Two years afterwards another private translation, called Matthews' Bible, was printed by the king's printers, and Cranmer himself applied for the king's licence that it might be circulated and read till the version on which the bishops were engaged should appear. In 1539 another translation was made by Richard Taverner, one of the canons of Wolsey's New College at Oxford. About twenty-five versions of the New Testament were in circulation, besides these versions of the whole Bible. In 1539 the king's printers brought out another version, called the "Great Bible," "translated after the Hebrew and Greek texts by diverse excellent learned men," which was no doubt the one which Cranmer had had done; and a reprint of it in the following year, 1540, contains a preface by him. Other versions followed in rapid succession, and in 1551 an order in council authorized the sale of nine different editions of Great or Folio Bibles; they were to be sold unbound at 10*s.*, and bound at 12*s.*, sums equal to £6 and £7 of our money. But none of these translations were satisfactory, and the Convocation appointed committees to take steps to obtain a new one. The king, however, interposed, and expressed his will and pleasure that the work should be committed to the Universities. No steps were taken by the Universities, and thus the great work was postponed till the reign of James I. The Great Bible of 1539 (of which the Psalms in our present Prayer Book is a portion) continued to be the authorized version of the Church of England till 1568; when it was superseded by that made under the direction of Archbishop Parker; which in turn gave way to that of James I.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE FOREIGN ELEMENT IN THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

THE progress of reformation lagged in the latter years of Henry's reign. It took a fresh start in the short six years' reign of the boy who succeeded him on the throne. We need not, happily, enter into the political events of the time. The government was in the hands of a council, of which Cranmer was a member. He seems to have taken no active part in any of its proceedings except, as in duty bound, in those which bore on the subject of religion. The leading men took advantage of their opportunity to strip the Church a little more closely of her property. The chantries were suppressed and their endowments confiscated to the king (*i. e.* to the nobles) by an Act of 1547. Any abuses involved in them might have been removed without the confiscation of the endowments. The chantries in many cases virtually supplied additional clergymen to help the curates of the parish churches within which they were founded, and in some cases the chantry chapels were virtually endowed chapels of ease to the parish churches. In any case they might have been appropriated to the provision of additional clergymen—sorely needed now the whole body of regular clergy was swept away—or to the increase of the endowments of the parishes impoverished by the alienation of their great tithes. Cranmer and the other bishops opposed the act, and pleaded that the chantries should be left till the king came of age, in the hope that

he would then make some such appropriation of them; but the nobles, suddenly enriched by grants of abbey lands, had got into habits of expense, and had gained a taste for property so easily acquired, and the chantry lands followed the rest. In other ways too the Church was plundered. Estates were taken away from the endowments of the sees; preferments, such as deaneries and prebends, were handed over to be held by laymen; *e.g.* when Ridley, Bishop of London, was about to confer a prebend in his cathedral on Grindal, afterwards archbishop, the council interposed and appropriated it to the expenses of the king's stable. Moreover fresh commissioners were sent out in the last year of Edward's reign to gather in the gleanings of Church lands and Church ornaments which might have escaped former inquisitors.

The doctrinal reformation of this reign more especially claims our attention. The Duke of Somerset, who had been made Lord Protector, was in favour of further changes; Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, the leader of those who clung to the old theology, and Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, a man of high character and great moderation, were for leaving matters as they had been placed by the late king until Edward should come of age. But Tunstal was dismissed from his seat at the council of regency, and Gardiner was committed to the Fleet prison, and the Reformation went on. The council ordered the discontinuance of some of the ancient ceremonies, such as the use of candles on Candlemas Day, ashes on Ash Wednesday, palms on Palm Sunday, &c. It also issued an order for the removal of images out of churches, which, executed without discrimination by fanatical commissioners, led to the mutilation and destruction of many beautiful works of ancient art; the statues which ornamented the

niches of churches were broken, churchyard crosses broken down, painted windows shattered, the fresco decorations on the walls obliterated. But, more important than these removals of superstitious objects from before their eyes, were the steps which were taken to build up ampler knowledge and sound doctrine in the people's minds. It was ordered that Erasmus's paraphrase of the New Testament should be placed beside the Bible in every parish church. A book of homilies, twelve in number, was issued, treating of some of the principal doctrines in dispute between the Roman and the reforming parties; and still further in the same direction was Cranmer's Catechism, an exposition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, taken chiefly from one of the German catechisms published a little before.

In the same year came out the New Prayer Book, which had long been in the hands of the commissioners appointed by Henry VIII. The commissioners had acted in this most important matter on the same principles which had guided them in the rest of the work of the Reformation. They did not sit down to frame a new mode of Divine worship for the English branch of Christ's Church, but to revise the existing mode—to prune away what was objectionable, to retain what was useful, and to reduce it to the standard of primitive antiquity. Every existing branch of the Church had a written liturgy, and all those liturgies in their general outline and main features corresponded. The liturgiologist tracing them up to their source finds that they can be classed in four families, springing from four liturgies, attributed to the apostles St. James, St. Mark, St. Peter, and St. John; the first was the Liturgy of Jerusalem, the second of Alexandria, the third of Rome, and the fourth of Ephe-

sus; and these four can be traced to a time so very early, and bear so strong a family likeness, that it is reasonable to suppose that they are all modifications of one original liturgy used by the Apostolic Church; transmitted orally in the earliest times, and so assuming modified forms by the time they were committed to writing. Every branch of the Church has exercised the power of adding to the liturgy and modifying it from time to time, to adapt it to the use of changing times and circumstances.

Tracing the history of the liturgy in use in the English Church, we find that missionaries from the Church of Ephesus planted the Church at Lyons in the middle of the 2nd century, and thus introduced the Ephesine liturgy into France; probably about the same time, and from the same source, the Church was planted in Spain, and the same liturgy was introduced there also. We have already seen (chapter II., page 14) that it is probable that the Church came to Britain from Gaul in the middle of the 3rd century, and the same liturgy was then introduced here. Minor alterations had probably given slightly varied forms to the liturgies of Gaul, Spain, and Britain, but in the main they agreed, and were all, beyond doubt, derived from that called the Liturgy of St. John. The liturgy used by the Roman Church was probably of equal antiquity with that used by the Church of Ephesus, and was traditionally attributed to St. Peter. When St. Augustine came to England he found different liturgies from the Roman use to which he had been accustomed. Bishop Liudhard, the chaplain of Queen Bertha, would no doubt use the Gallican liturgy; the British Christians with whom Augustine was brought into communication used the British variety of the Ephesine liturgy. Augustine referred to Gregory for directions what course he should take. Gregory's advice

was to choose from every Church those things which were good and edifying, and to make them up into one body and use it for the English Church. It is therefore probable that Augustine did introduce some modifications, which gave the liturgy of the English Church from his time to the Conquest a character of its own. We have already had to note how St. Osmund, Bishop of Salisbury, immediately after the Norman Conquest, again revised the English liturgy; and the Salisbury use formed the basis of the other slightly varying uses which obtained in other dioceses in England. The Salisbury use was eventually adopted throughout the southern province, and it was this which the Reformers took in hand to revise for the use of the Reformed Church of England. The superstitious accretions of the Middle Ages they removed; many symbolical ceremonies were omitted; the service was simplified generally; but the substance of the primitive liturgy was retained.

The mediæval offices of the Breviary for the hours of prayer—Matins, Prime, Terce, Sext, None, Vespers, and Compline—were next abbreviated and condensed into two offices for Matins and Evensong. The occasional offices were added, the office for baptism being considerably simplified in ceremonial, but made to speak still more clearly and fully the Christian doctrine of baptism.

When the divines had completed their work, this First Prayer Book of Edward VI. was submitted first to Convocation, that it might go forth with the full authority of the Church; then it was laid before the king in council; who sent it to Parliament, that it might be incorporated into an Act of Parliament. This Act, the first Act of Uniformity, passed in January, 1548-9, enacted, that the new Prayer Book should be used in all churches on the following Whitsun Day, June 9, 1549.

This Prayer Book may be taken as expressing the results at which our English Reformers arrived before the encroachment of foreign influences.

About this time several of the noted foreign Reformers took refuge in England, from actual or apprehended persecution. Bucer was provided for as Divinity Professor at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr in the same capacity at Oxford; John à Lasco, a Zuinglian, was allowed to establish a congregation in London. Calvin himself entered into correspondence with the king and Cranmer; and under these influences the opinions and spirit of the Calvinist and Zuinglian reformations began to leaven our own. An endeavour was made to unite all the reformed bodies in one common confession of faith; but this was found impracticable, and our Reformers proceeded to draw up independent articles of faith on the principal points in dispute between themselves and Rome.

When Somerset was deposed from his high office in 1549 A.D., Warwick came into power, who favoured the views of the foreign Reformers. In 1551 Gardiner was tried, deprived, and committed to custody; other bishops, also, were deprived on pretence of disobedience—Day, Bishop of Chichester; Heath, of Worcester; Voysey, of Exeter. Other bishops were attacked, and obliged to purchase indemnity at the price of the sacrifice of some of the property of their sees, viz., the Bishops of Llandaff, Salisbury, and Coventry. It was the young king who stood between the greedy nobles and the utter ruin of the Church: "You have had among you," he said, "the abbeys, which you have consumed in superfluous apparel and dice and cards, and now you would have the bishops' lands and revenues to abuse likewise! Set your hearts at rest; there shall no such alteration be made while I live!"

The First Prayer Book had hardly got into use before a revision of it was commenced, with a view especially to satisfy the objections made by the foreign Reformers, and those who agreed with them here; and the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. was published in 1552. It marks the extent to which the English Reformation was drawn in the direction of Calvinistic and Zuinglian doctrine and ritual by these foreign influences. The alterations most important in point of doctrine were, the abolition of the ancient vestments of the clergy; the removal of the celebrant from the front of the altar to the north side of the table; the reduction, in the prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, of the commendation of the saints departed to God's mercy, to a slighter commemoration of them. The invocation of the Holy Spirit on the bread and wine, which occurs in many ancient liturgies, was omitted; the mixing of water with the wine of the Sacrament was struck out, and the admission of ordinary bread as "sufficient" in place of unleavened bread was inserted. The words spoken at the distribution of the elements were altered; in place of "the body of our Lord, which was given for thee, &c.," was substituted the sentence, "Take and eat this in remembrance, &c.," and the like change at the delivery of the cup. The oblative prayer, "O Lord and Heavenly Father," and the Lord's Prayer, instead of being said before the Communion, were removed into the post-Communion. Other considerable alterations were made not so clearly associated with doctrine. The sentences, exhortation, confession, and absolution were prefixed to the Morning and Evening Prayer; and the Commandments and suffrages to the Communion Office; the Litany was ordered to be said on Sundays, as well as Wednesdays and Fridays; and other changes too numerous to be detailed here.

There is no certain proof that this Second Prayer Book ever received the sanction of Convocation, but it is highly improbable that Cranmer would have allowed it to get into Parliament without it. Edward's second Act of Uniformity, with this Second Prayer Book attached, was passed on April 6, 1552, the new book to come into use on the Feast of all Saints (November 1) following. Three editions of the book were printed, but on September 27 the further issue of those printed was forbidden by an Order in Council; it was apparently contemplated to make further alterations in its rubrics at the desire of the king, if Cranmer's consent should be given. The king died on the 6th of July in the following year; and it seems very unlikely that this Second Prayer Book was ever taken into general use.

In 1553, Forty-two Articles of Religion were put forth by the king's authority as the standard of reformed doctrine.

The policy of the Reformation has again become the subject of keen discussion in our days, and it is not unnecessary to take a summary view of it and try to estimate for ourselves its real merits and defects. On the whole we recognize abundant cause to thank God heartily with our forefathers for the "glorious Reformation." On the whole we think that the whole world has cause to be thankful for the results of the English Reformation.

The tendency of revolutions is to run into extremes in principles; for men will think that the opposite of an error must be truth, whereas it is another error, and the truth lies between the two; they are apt to pull down the institutions with which they are dissatisfied in order to have free room to build up new ones, not knowing that institutions are like trees, which grow, and their

roots and branches are entwined with the whole mind and character, and social and domestic habits of a people; if violently pulled up society is torn to pieces, and it takes long for other institutions to grow; they are not like houses, which can be pulled down and new ones built out of the old materials.

This common error of revolutions our English Reformers did not fall into. They were, no doubt, greatly favoured by political circumstances, but they have the merit of having taken wise advantage of the circumstances. In reforming doctrine they aimed at retaining the Christian faith, as fully contained in the Scripture and ascertained by the witness of the early Church, and defined in the Catholic creeds; they took their stand on the four general councils; they only pruned away certain developments of doctrine, whose growth in the Middle Ages was matter of history, and which were contrary to the standards of the faith. In settling the worship of the Church they proceeded in the same way. They took the ancient services as their basis, removed the superstitious accretions of later centuries, but retained substantially the same worship which had grown up in the earlier and purer times of the Church. One of the most important features of the English Reformation, in which it differed from the course of the Reformation on the Continent, was that it was not the formation of a new religious body outside the existing Church, but it was a reformation of the Church itself. It was not so much a movement of the people, acting apart from or against the authorities in Church and State, as a movement in which the authorities in Church and State were the leaders of the people. This partly accounts for the conservatism which runs throughout the English Reformation. It had this consequence also, that the Reformed

Church retained its ancient religious organization, the succession of its clergy, its territorial (parochial) system, its hold upon schools and universities, its endowments; especially it retained its connection with the State.

But while we refuse to allow our sense of the blessings which the Reformation conferred upon England to be swept away by modern criticism, we need not shut our eyes to the truth that there were grave defects in the work of the Reformation; rather we shall do wisely to consider them, in order that in the great Church movement through which we are now passing we may learn wisdom from the past—may at least avoid its blunders, and if possible may remedy its defects.

One of its greatest defects was that the opportunity was not taken to enlarge and re-arrange the machinery of the Church and make it adequate to the spiritual wants of the people. The monastic system may have outlived its usefulness; the orders of itinerant preachers may have declined from their original zeal, and become a hindrance rather than a help to the parochial clergy; the chantries may have had their basis in superstition. But when the monasteries and the friars and the chantry priests were swept away, the insufficiency of the secular clergy to deal with the spiritual wants of the population was evident enough; and steps ought to have been taken to re-organize, extend, and strengthen the sole remaining ministerial agency. More of the monasteries ought to have been turned into episcopal sees. Others might have been retained as schools and colleges. The great tithes of the parishes which had been appropriated to the monasteries ought to have been restored to the parishes and used for the endowment of more parochial clergymen. The chantries afforded another opportunity of maintaining an increased staff of clergy, and many of the

chantry chapels would have supplied the population for all these 300 years with the system of school-chapels and mission-chapels which we are now beginning to create. We have seen that the Reformers did not overlook the subject. Wolsey had begun to appropriate the endowments of some of the smaller houses to the encouragement of learning. Henry proposed to found new sees and increase poor benefices. In Edward VI.'s reign the bishops wished to reserve the chantry endowments for the increase of the clergy. Jewel tried hard to persuade Elizabeth and her nobles to improve the livings out of the great tithes which had fallen to them. Laud had a scheme for gradually buying up the impropriations and restoring them to the parishes. The covetousness of the kings and nobles frustrated all these schemes. The opportunity to adjust the ecclesiastical establishment of the nation to its spiritual wants was lost, and the nation has suffered for it ever since. It is only within the present century that the nation has begun fairly to make some efforts to supply the knowledge of the Gospel and the means of grace to the rapidly-increasing population. But larger views of our wants and a more general effort to supply them are sorely needed: the Reformation, with all its spoliation, left twenty bishops and about ten thousand clergymen to minister to a population of less than five millions; we have now nearly forty bishops, and about double the number of clergymen, to cope with the spiritual needs of forty millions of souls; our new churches are chiefly in the well-to-do suburbs of towns, largely dependent on pew-rents; and there are large sections of the people, especially in the great industrial areas, who are quite unaffected by the work of any of the religious denominations.

Another great defect of the Reformation was that it left the Church without any system of discipline, a defect which has existed now for so many generations that the ordinary Churchman of the present day hardly knows what the word means, and has no just idea of the greatness of the defect in theory, and of its serious practical results. In theory the existence of discipline is so important that our Reformers over and over again include it among the marks of a true Church. The second part of the Homily for Whitsun Day, set forth early in Elizabeth's reign, gives these as notes of the Church: "It hath always these notes or marks whereby it is known—pure and sound doctrine, the sacraments administered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline." The Catechism of Edward VI., A.D. 1553, says: "The marks of the Church are, first, pure preaching of the Gospel; then brotherly love; thirdly, upright and uncorrupted use of the Lord's sacraments, according to the ordinance of the Gospel; last of all, brotherly correction or excommunication, or banishing those out of the Church that will not amend themselves; this mark the holy fathers termed discipline." Bishop Ridley, in one of his works, says: "The marks whereby this Church is known unto me, in this dark world, and in the midst of this crooked and froward generation, are these—the sincere preaching of God's Word; the due administration of the sacraments; charity; and faithful observance of ecclesiastical discipline according to the Word of God." In the Commination Service the Church laments the absence of this "godly discipline," and says "it is very much to be wished that it should be restored again."

Here again the defect is not the fault of the Reformers. Cranmer drew up a code which he called *Reformatio*

Legum Ecclesiasticarum, which underwent many revisions in private during the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI. The bishops, in the reign of Edward VI., complained to the king that the abrogation of the canon law had left the Church without discipline, and commissioners were appointed to draw up a body of canons, but their work did not see the light. Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum* was revived by the Puritans in the Lower House of Parliament, under Elizabeth, with a view to its having legal force given to it, but the queen thought that it trenched on her supremacy and would not have it enacted. It was reprinted under Charles I.; and brought again under public notice by Bishop Burnet, in the time of William and Mary.[1]

The substitute for a regular system of discipline was found in the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown as supreme governor of the Church. This was vested from time to time in ecclesiastical commissioners and courts of high commission; and the abuse of this power by the unconstitutional bodies to which it was entrusted was one of the great grievances which brought the Church into odium from the time of Elizabeth down to the time of William III. But even with these drawbacks of over exercise of power, we have the authority of the excellent Sir Matthew Hale for the amount of good exercised by such a tribunal in restraining moral offences untouched by the civil law.

[1] Bishop Wilson drew up a set of Ecclesiastical Constitutions of the Church for his little diocese of Man.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE MARIAN PERSECUTION

On the death of the boy king, July 6, 1553, the ambitious scheme of Northumberland to place his own family on the throne, through Lady Jane Grey, collapsed, and Mary's title was universally acknowledged by the nation. Gardiner, Bonner, Tunstall, Day, Heath, and Voysey were reinstated in their sees, and the first-named, who during the previous reign had been the moving spirit of the Roman party, was made chancellor, and became the queen's chief minister. Holgate, Archbishop of York, Coverdale of Exeter, Ridley of London, and Hooper of Gloucester were sent to prison, and old Latimer was sent soon after. Cranmer, in reply to rumours of his tergiversation, having issued a paper in which he used violent expressions against the Mass, was thrown into prison, ostensibly on account of the part he had taken in putting Lady Jane on the throne. John à Lasco was ordered to depart with his foreign congregation; the greater part of the foreign Protestants followed him. With them went some 800 English, chiefly students, who had reason to apprehend personal danger under Mary. These settled in Frankfort and in Switzerland, and there contracted the sentiments of the foreign reformers, and a disaffection for the Church of England. On their return, under Elizabeth, they became the seeds of the party which, a century later, overthrew the Church and monarchy.

Mary's first Parliament assembled, and, by the influence of the court and the reluctance of those who were opposed to the expected change of religion to put themselves into a dangerous opposition to the court, it consisted chiefly of those who were prepared to comply with the queen's wishes. This Parliament, by a single Act, repealed all the laws, nineteen in number, passed since 1528 to the detriment of the Holy See, and things reverted to nearly the state in which they stood before the first step of the Reformation was taken.

Eight of the bishops were removed from their sees: the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Bristol, Chester, and St. David's were removed because they were married; the Bishops of Gloucester, Hereford, and Lincoln on the plea that they held their sees only by letters patent during pleasure, such being really the tenure on which King Edward's advisers had nominated them; the Bishop of Bath and Wells fled to the Continent; Scorey of Chichester escaped immediate expulsion by renouncing his wife and doing penance, but he too was soon after ejected. The clergy were allowed a year during which to renounce their heresy and put away their wives if married, and some hundreds of them were at length ejected on this account or resigned their offices.

The queen had already intimated to the Pope, Julius III., her desire to reconcile herself and her kingdom to the Holy See, and begged that Cardinal Pole might be sent as his legate to effect this end. Next year Pole arrived in the character of legate. Parliament voted an address, asking for reconciliation with the Holy See, and Pole pronounced a solemn absolution. Parliament, however, took care to stipulate that the Church property should not be restored. New nobles had been endowed out of the Church lands, the old nobles had received

additions to their ancestral estates, and so many men all over the country had shared in the plunder in one way or another, that it was seen that the restoration of Romanism could only be effected at the cost of the abandonment of the property of the Church. The queen herself, greatly to her honour, restored the abbey lands which had been attached to the Crown, and founded ten new religious houses out of them; she also gave up all the first-fruits and tenths which had been seized by Henry VIII.[1]

And now the court adopted the policy which had been followed in other states of Europe, of endeavouring to put down the new opinions, and compel obedience to the established Church, by severity and terror.

It would occupy too much space to go through the stories of the martyrs who suffered in this persecution; but in order to give an adequate impression of a passage in the history of the English Church which has had so vast an influence on the mind of the Church and people from that time to this, we shall select the three great popular heroes of the Reformation—Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer—and sketch the story of their sufferings and death.

All three had been concerned in the usurpation of the Lady Jane, and at the accession of Mary had been committed to the Tower. The charge of treason was, however, condoned, and they were proceeded against as heretics. The Tower being full of prisoners, the three bishops, together with Bradford, were put together into one room,

[1] These were all re-annexed to the Crown on the accession of Elizabeth. The first-fruits and tenths were finally restored to the Church by Queen Anne, being vested in a board of trustees, under the name of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, for the augmentation of poor livings.

where they spent six months, passing their time chiefly in reading the New Testament and conversing on religious subjects. At length a commission was appointed to conduct a disputation with them. The subject chosen as the test question was the doctrine of the Mass. The dispute was conducted in the University Church at Oxford, before the public, and in the regular form of a disputation in the schools. Three propositions were laid down :—

1. Whether the natural body of Christ was really in the Sacrament.

2. Whether any other substance did remain after the words of consecration than the body of Christ.

3. Whether in the Mass there was a sacrifice and propitiation for the quick and dead.

Each had a separate day assigned for his answer—Cranmer on the 16th, Ridley on the 17th, and Latimer on the 18th of April, 1554.

A report of the proceedings was made by notaries, Cranmer and Ridley committed also to writing all that they could remember, and the two reports agree in the main. Ridley sustained his great reputation for learning and ability. The report of his defence may be read with great interest and profit, as a statement of the doctrine for which the Reformers died, and an elaborate argument in its favour. The doctrine is of course the same which is set forth in the Catechism, the Articles, and the Communion Service, the doctrine of a presence of Christ in the Sacrament, not a gross, carnal presence to be pressed by the teeth, but a spiritual presence communicated to the spirit of the faithful recipient. They were all condemned as heretics. Ridley and Latimer were put into the custody of private individuals, Cranmer was remitted to the prison in Oxford.

At the end of September in the following year, after a suspense of eighteen months, commissioners came from Cardinal Pole, Legate and Archbishop of Canterbury elect, authorized to accept the recantation of Ridley and Latimer, or to confirm their sentence as heretics, and go through the ceremony of degrading them from their episcopal character, and then to hand them over to the civil power to undergo punishment according to law. The case of Cranmer, as a metropolitan, had to be referred to the Pope, which occasioned five months' further delay. We extract from Foxe's 'Acts and Monuments' some particulars of their execution:—"Upon the north side of the town of Oxford, in the ditch over again Baliol College, the place of execution was appointed. Dr. Ridley went to the place dressed in a black furred gown, and velvet tippet, and velvet cap, such as he used to wear as a bishop, walking between the mayor and one of the aldermen. After him came Mr. Latimer in a poor Bristol frieze frock, much worn, and under it a new long shroud down to his feet all ready for the fire; so that men beheld on one side the honour they sometime had, and on the other the calamity whereto they were fallen. When they met at the place of execution, Ridley embraced Latimer with a very cheerful look, and comforted him saying, 'Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or else strengthen us to abide it.' With that he went to the stake, kneeled down by it and earnestly prayed, and behind him Mr. Latimer kneeled, as earnestly calling upon God as he. Then a sermon was preached, to which the martyrs wished, but were not permitted, to reply. Then they prepared for the stake. Ridley gave away a number of little things as mementos to the friends about him; some plucked the points (fastenings) off his hose. Happy was he that

might get any rag of him. Mr. Latimer gave nothing, but suffered his keeper to pull off his hose and his coat, and so being stripped to his shroud, he stood bolt upright, and as comely a father as one might behold. They were fastened to the stake by a chain round the waist and faggots were piled about them. Ridley's brother tied a bag of gunpowder round his neck, and another round the neck of Latimer. Then they brought a lighted faggot and laid it at Dr. Ridley's feet. Thereupon Mr. Latimer said, 'Be of good comfort, Mr. Ridley, and play the man; we shall this day light such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out.' When Dr. Ridley saw the fire flaming up towards him, he cried with a wonderful loud voice, 'Into Thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit; Lord, receive my spirit;' and, after, repeated this often, 'Lord, Lord, receive my spirit.' Mr. Latimer cried as vehemently on the other side, 'O Father of heaven, receive my soul;' who received the flame as if embracing it. After he had stroked his face with his hands, and, as it were, bathed them a little in the fire, he soon died (as it appeareth) with very little or no pain. But Dr. Ridley, by the ill-making of the fire, the faggots being green and built up too high, the fire being kept down by the green wood, burnt fiercely beneath, which put him to such exquisite pain that he desired them for God's sake to let the fire come unto him. In mistaken kindness his brother-in-law heaped faggots upon him, which only made the fire more vehement beneath, so that he leaped up and down, crying, 'I cannot burn,' and his legs were consumed while the upper part of his body was yet untouched. At length one of the by-standers with his bill pulled off the faggots above, and the martyr wrested his body over to that side, and the flame touched the gunpowder and he was seen to stir no

more, and his body fell over the chain at Mr. Latimer's feet, and so the fire consumed them. What reward remaineth for them in heaven, the day of God's glory, when He cometh with His saints, shall shortly declare."

Cranmer's sentence was at length pronounced by the Pope. He was degraded from his episcopal character with circumstances of unfeeling insult. But then an attempt was made to induce him to recant. He was removed from prison and became the guest of the Dean of Christchurch, where he was treated with courtesy and kindness. He was told that the king and queen greatly desired his conversion; that the council was kindly disposed towards him; that it was a pity his great learning, which might profit so many, should be lost to the Church; life was made sweet to him; the recantation was made easy; the friends whose courage had been wont to sustain him were absent, and his constitutional timidity and irresolution betrayed him, and he signed a recantation. But what was intended was, to injure the cause of the Reformation by the recantation of its great representative: it was not intended to spare his life. A series of recantations were now extracted from him, each rising above the others in its strength, while at the very time that they were being wrung from him the preparations were being made for his execution. It would seem that he was left to indulge the expectation of pardon up to the very morning of his death.

On the 21st of March, 1556, Cranmer was brought out of prison and taken to St. Mary's Church, and placed on a low platform in front of the pulpit, to hear his "condemned sermon." Dr. Cole, who preached the sermon, took for granted his reconciliation with the Church, exhorted him to courage in the prospect of death, and to take comfort from the example of the

penitent thief. The sermon ended, Cranmer was called upon to read his recantation before the mayor and aldermen there assembled, and the whole congregation. But his first words were words of prayer for true repentance, for mercy through Christ to him the most wretched and miserable of sinners; he concluded with the Lord's Prayer, the whole congregation kneeling down and saying it aloud with him. "Never," says a spectator, "was there such a number so earnestly praying together. Cranmer himself an image of sorrow, the dolour of his heart bursting out at his eyes in plenty of tears; but in other respects retaining 'the quiet and grave behaviour which was natural to him.' Rising from his knees he turned to address the people, but at first the swaying of the great congregation drowned his voice; shortly, in the increasing silence, his voice was heard repeating the Apostles' Creed—it was his farewell confession of faith. But as he proceeded, astonishment and anger began to rise in the minds of his adversaries; he was not making any recantation, but solemnly affirming the doctrines of the Reformation. For his recantation, he declared that 'it troubled his conscience more than anything that ever he did or said in his whole life; and forasmuch,' said he, 'as my hand offended writing contrary to my heart, my hand shall first be punished therefor, for may I come to the fire, it shall be first burned. And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as being Christ's enemy and anti-Christ, with all his false doctrine.' 'Stop the heretic's mouth and take him away,' cried Cole; and he was pulled down from the platform and carried away to punishment. He suffered on the same spot as Ridley and Latimer. He did not tarry long at his prayers, but putting off his garments he stood in his long white shirt reaching to the ground, his feet bare, his head bald, his beard long and

thick, he presented a moving spectacle. Fastened to the stake, and surrounded by faggots, as soon as the fire began to burn up about him he thrust his right hand into it and held it there till it was consumed, repeating, 'This unworthy right hand,' and 'Lord, receive my spirit;' and took his death with singular courage, seeming to move no more than the stake to which he was bound."

Cardinal Pole became Archbishop of Canterbury and Papal Legate. A visitation was held of the Church and Universities, English Bibles and heretical books were burnt, and the full Roman system was restored.

During three years the persecution continued. It is computed that in that time 277 persons were brought to the stake, besides those who were punished by imprisonment, fines, and confiscations. Among those who suffered by fire were five bishops, twenty-one clergymen, eight lay gentlemen, eighty-four tradesmen, 100 husbandmen, servants, and labourers, fifty-five women, and four children.

The majority of the people, terrified by the persecution, outwardly conformed; but the fires of Smithfield burnt into the heart of the nation an undying hatred of Romanism.

Mary died on the 17th November, 1558, and Cardinal Pole died on the next day. The field was open for the re-establishment of the Reformation.

CHAPTER XXV

THE FINAL SETTLEMENT OF THE REFORMATION

ELIZABETH had conformed to the national Church during her sister's reign, but it was well known that she favoured the Reformation. On her accession she proceeded with great caution. Her title to the throne was open to dispute. The Roman court, if it saw that the obedience of England was again to be withdrawn, might raise up factions against her within the kingdom, and perhaps set on enemies from without. These fears were by no means ill founded. When the queen notified her accession to the Pope, Paul IV., he replied that the kingdom of England was held in fief of the Apostolic See, that Elizabeth, being illegitimate, could not succeed to the throne, that her assumption of the government without his sanction was an impertinence; yet, if she would renounce her pretensions, and refer herself wholly to his free disposition, he would do whatever might be done without damage to the Holy See. The state of parties in England made caution necessary. The queen and her chief advisers were in favour of a moderate reformation, which, while it asserted the freedom of the Church from the Roman yoke, and adopted the reforms of doctrine and ritual which had been effected by the English Reformers, maintained the Catholicity of the Church. In taking this course she had to expect opposition from two quarters. On one side were those who were heartily opposed to the Reformation, and a still

larger number of others who had been sincere Reformers at first, but had been alarmed by the tendencies displayed by the Reformers of Edward VI., acting under foreign influences, and who now clung to the connexion with the rest of Christendom as the safeguard against extreme changes. Many of this party probably hoped to combine a recognition of the Pope as the centre of the organization of the Church, with a considerable amount of reform in this English branch of the Church. And we shall see presently reason to believe that the Pope actually offered to accept a large part of the results of the Reformation of the Church in England, if that Church would continue its mediæval relations with the Roman See. On the other side was the party whose aim was to sweep away the ancient Church of England altogether, and to establish a new sect in its place, with a Presbyterian form of organization and Calvinistic doctrines; and this party was made powerful by the return of many who during the late reign had taken refuge on the Continent from persecution, many of them men of learning and piety, and whose sufferings for conscience' sake gave them great influence with the people.

On Cecil's recommendation, Matthew Parker was summoned to advise the queen on religious questions. He had been Queen Anne Boleyn's chaplain, and in her last interview with him she had specially commended her infant daughter Elizabeth to his care. He had risen to be master of Benet College, Cambridge, and Dean of Lincoln, in the time of Edward VI. On the accession of Mary, he had been compelled to retire from all his benefices as a married clergyman; but instead of fleeing to the Continent he had lived in great retirement in the house of one of his friends. He was a man well fitted for the task which lay before him by learning, especially

a deep knowledge of the writings of the Fathers, by sound yet moderate churchmanship, and by statesman-like sagacity and breadth of view.

Elizabeth and her advisers, Cecil and Parker, desired to adopt the Reformation as the English Reformers had left it, taking the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. as their standard. But it was necessary to conciliate the Puritan party, many of the more moderate of whom might be won by some concessions. The Second Prayer Book was ready to hand. It had been originally drawn up with a view to conciliate the Puritans. By adopting it they would avoid a re-opening of the whole subject for discussion in an unfriendly Convocation. It was therefore again accepted as a compromise, with some alterations.[1] It was adopted by Parliament, and incorporated into a new Act of Uniformity passed June 24, 1559; and out of 9400 clergymen only 189 refused to adopt it. The Act of Supremacy passed at the same time again threw off the Papal supremacy, and re-asserted the freedom of the English Church. Elizabeth did not assume in this Act the title "Head of the Church," which had been so liable to misinterpretation, but that of "Supreme Governor of all persons and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil;" and the ancient and legitimate authority of the Crown was carefully defined.

[1] The prayer, "From the tyranny of the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, good Lord deliver us," was omitted from the Litany in 1552; the rubric which declared that no adoration was intended in the kneeling posture at the reception of Holy Communion, was now omitted. Proper lessons for Sundays were introduced; prayers for the queen, clergy, and people were introduced from the ancient offices. The rubric retaining the ancient vestments was inserted. "The accustomed place or Chancel," instead of "in such place as the people may best hear," was appointed for the celebration of Divine Service. The words at the administration of the consecrated elements from the First Book of Edward were prefixed to those of the Second Book, as in our present Prayer Book.

A previous Act had repealed the Repealing Act of Mary, but did not indiscriminately revive the legislation of Edward or of Henry; it carefully selected some of their Acts for revival and left others unrevived; the general effect being to relax the rigid grasp of the Crown upon the Church, and to restore to the Church something of its former liberties. Soon after the passing of these Acts the bishops, with some of the leading divines of their party, were summoned before the queen in council, and invited to take the oath of supremacy. It happened that the plague which raged in the last year of Queen Mary's reign had caused a remarkable mortality among the bishops; four died just before the queen's decease, and six immediately after, so that ten sees were vacant, and there were only fifteen diocesans remaining. In reply to the invitation to conform to the new order of things, Heath, Archbishop of York, spoke on behalf of his brethren, requesting the queen to adhere to the engagements made by Mary with the Roman See. The queen answered with spirit: "Our records show that the Papal jurisdiction over this realm was usurpation . . . . It is by following the proceedings which have come down to me from a long line of predecessors that I mean to rule . . . . To no power whatever is my crown subject save to that of Christ the King of kings. I shall therefore regard as enemies, both to God and myself, all such of my subjects as shall henceforth own any foreign or usurped authority within my realm." Fourteen bishops refused the oath, Kitchin of Llandaff being the only one who accepted it. Those who refused were at once deposed; only two of them, Winchester and Lincoln, were at all harshly treated; three were allowed to retire abroad; the rest were committed to the custody of their own friends or of their episcopal brethren—*i. e.* a deposed

bishop was quartered on one of the actual bishops. In most cases the deposed bishop lived in the family of his entertainer; in some cases it was found more pleasant to both parties that he should have his own apartments.

A great proportion of the deans, archdeacons, and heads of colleges also declined the oath; but the parochial clergy, with only about 100 exceptions, accepted the oath of supremacy and the new service-book, and continued in their cures, some retaining more and some less of the ancient ritual to which they had been accustomed. With the people at large the return to the principles of the Reformation was popular.

The fact that so many dignitaries refused the new order of things is remarkable. In the first great renunciation of the Roman obedience in 1534, the Convocations took the lead, and the whole body of the bishops and clergy readily followed it. In all the subsequent reforms of the reign of Henry VIII. and the beginning of Edward VI., the bishops concurred. When Warwick came into power, and designed to carry the Reformation to extremes, Gardiner of Winchester, Day of Chichester, Heath of Worcester, and Voysey of Exeter, were deprived on pretext of disobedience in order to get rid of their opposition. On the accession of Mary these were restored, and in turn Cranmer of Canterbury, Ridley of London, Holgate of York, Coverdale of Exeter, and Hooper of Gloucester, were sent to prison; Barlow, of Bath and Wells, retired abroad. But in these cases a considerable majority of the bishops was left. Now, between the ten vacant sees and the fourteen bishops who were deprived for refusing the oath of supremacy, only one diocesan bishop was left, and the Church was placed in a position of considerable anxiety.

For from the beginning down to the 16th century the

Church universally considered the ministerial succession to be a matter of great importance, and always believed that that succession was through the episcopal order.

The importance of the ministerial succession depends on the principle, which has always been held in the Church of Christ, that our Lord Himself consecrated a ministry, giving them authority to rule His Church and power to convey special graces. A party which at this time began to assume considerable importance in the Church, and which gradually increased in power till it was able to overthrow the constitution of Church and State, believed in the Divine appointment of the ministry, in its authority to rule, and in its power to transmit supernatural graces; but it believed that the succession was in the presbyters; and that the government of the Church by bishops, and their assumption of sole power to ordain, was a usurpation. There was still a third party, as yet insignificant in numbers, but destined to triumph both over the Church and monarch, and over the Parliament and presbytery, who did not believe in any divinely-appointed ministry at all, or that any men had authority to rule the Church, except such men as the people might voluntarily delegate to exercise it for the sake of order; who denied that they had power to transmit any supernatural graces; these were the Independents in religion, who were, quite consistently, Republicans in politics. The Church of England believed then, and believes still, in the divinely-appointed ministry transmitted through the episcopate, and therefore was very solicitous for the regular succession of its bishops.

We have said that only one of the old diocesan bishops remained, and he was not a man of very high character. It is held by all theologians that the conse-

cration of a bishop by a single bishop would be valid, and quite justifiable in case of necessity, but irregular; for the canons of the Council of Nice, for greater security, required that two others should concur with the metropolitan in the consecration of a bishop. But the Church was not reduced to the necessity of an irregular consecration. Several of the bishops who had been deprived at the accession of Mary were still living. William Barlow, who had been Bishop of Bath and Wells, and was now elect of Chichester, John Scory, who had been Bishop of Chichester, and was now elect of Hereford, Miles Coverdale, who had been Bishop of Exeter, John Hodgkin, a suffragan bishop of Bedford, who also had been deprived, and several other suffragans. Notwithstanding, then, the ten vacancies and the defection of the fourteen diocesans, the Church had ample means for continuing her succession.

The first step was to consecrate a metropolitan, who would then, according to the canons, preside at the consecration of the other bishops requisite to fill the vacant sees. Matthew Parker at first declined the onerous office, and it was offered to two others; but on their refusal it was again pressed upon Parker and accepted by him.

Whether Archbishop Parker was properly consecrated has been called into question. In 1604, forty-four years after Parker's consecration, an exiled Romish priest named Holywood, in a book published at Antwerp, started the story which has been called the "Nag's Head Fable." He said that the consecration of Parker was an irregular ceremony, performed at the "Nag's Head" tavern, a noted tavern of those days, which one Neale, a chaplain of Bonner's, witnessed by peeping through a hole in the door. This fable, which made a good deal of noise when

first published, and which is still raked up from time to time by ignorant or malicious opponents, is now completely exploded. There is abundant evidence to prove that Parker was solemnly consecrated in Lambeth chapel. The archbishop himself mentions it in one of his printed works, and there is an entry of it in his private diary. The official record of it still exists in the register preserved at Lambeth. The Earl of Nottingham, who was present, gave testimony to it in his place in the House of Lords, when it was first questioned. Roman Catholic writers of eminence have admitted his formal and valid consecration, as Courayer, Lingard, Canon Tierney, Charles Butler. Several modern writers have lately re-investigated the history, and have no doubt on the subject. Mr. Haddan, in his edition of the works of Archbishop Bramhall, has gone very fully into the subject; and all the original documents given in evidence have been zincographed and published. The truth is that the critical nature of the consecration was fully understood, and great pains were taken to fulfil all the legal and canonical requirements. The queen issued her *congé d'élire* to the Chapter of Canterbury, and Parker was duly elected and confirmed. A commission was issued to certain of the bishops, and four of them were the actual consecrators. The chief part was taken by Barlow.[1] The other three were John Hodgkin, Miles

[1] It has been objected that Barlow was not properly consecrated, on the ground that the record of his consecration is not forthcoming. It is true that the record is omitted from the Lambeth Register, as also are several others, for the registry at that time was badly kept; and the register of his own cathedral is lost. But he was one of the statesmen-bishops of Henry VIII., and would take care that his own consecration was valid; he was always acknowledged to be a bishop both by Anglicans and Romanists to the end of his life. The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Stubbs), the great authority on such questions, says that there is no reason whatever to doubt the fact of his consecration.

Coverdale, and John Scory, before mentioned. The consecration took place in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, where many of Parker's predecessors had been consecrated; and we have a full account of the arrangement of the chapel and the order of the ceremony, in which it is evident that care was taken to observe every proper formality, and to make the ceremony solemn and stately. The consecration took place on the morning of December 17, 1559. The official persons whose duty it was to be present were there, together with a company of private and official friends of Parker's. With the exception of Coverdale, who appeared only in a gown, the bishops wore the episcopal vestments, and Parker his scarlet convocation robes. The sermon was preached by Scory from the text 1 Peter v. 1: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder." The sermon ended, Bishop Barlow, as celebrant, and Archdeacon Bullingham and Archdeacon Gheast, the archbishop's chaplains, as epistoller and gospeller, put on silk copes, and celebrated Holy Communion. The consecration was conducted in accordance with the second ordinal of Edward VI. All the bishops laid their hands on the head of the elect, and all repeated the words of consecration: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of hands, for God hath not given unto us the spirit of fear, but of power, and love, and soberness." After the consecration the new archbishop, in going out of the door of the chapel, inaugurated the great officers of his household by giving their staves of office to his treasurer, the steward, and the controller; and then the whole company proceeded in procession to the hall of the palace.

The Archbishop of Canterbury being thus regularly

consecrated, the other sees were gradually filled. To the fact that so many sees and other dignities were left vacant, and that it was thought right to promote to them a large proportion of the most eminent of those who had suffered for conscience' sake in the previous reign, we owe the fact that the Puritan party at once became so powerful in the Church.

We have already noticed that immediately after Elizabeth's accession she received an insolent letter from the Pope. But a new Pope, Pius IV., in 1560 addressed to her a letter of very different tenor, making overtures for a reconciliation. There is sufficient evidence that, among other concessions, he offered, through his agent Parpalia, to approve of the Book of Common Prayer, including the Liturgy or Communion Service, and the Ordinal. Although his Holiness complained that many things were omitted from the Prayer Book which ought to be there, he admitted that the book nevertheless contained nothing contrary to the truth, while it comprehended all that is necessary for salvation. He was therefore prepared to authorize the book if the queen would receive it from him and on his authority.

The queen received a notification of the sitting of the Council of Trent; it was not, however, in the terms in which the Catholic sovereigns were invited to take part in the proceedings, but in the terms in which the Protestant sects were invited to be present. Partly on this account, partly because the council would not be "free, pious, and Christian," the queen declared that the Church of England should not be represented at it. And from this time friendly official intercourse has ceased between England and Rome. Still there was no irreparable schism between the two parties here; the people who did not approve of the present order

continued to attend their parish churches. An attempt was made to obtain toleration both for the Papal and for the Puritan party. The Emperor and some of the princes of Germany wrote to the queen on behalf of the Papal party, asking that the deprived bishops might officiate as "vacant bishops," and might have assigned to them certain churches in large towns. The effect of this would have been to create and perpetuate a Romish schism. The queen replied, that "to grant them separate churches, and permit them to keep up a distinct communion, were things which neither the public interest nor her own honour would allow." In the course of her reply she reiterates the assertion so often and so forcibly made of the continuity and Catholicity of the reformed Church of England; she argues that the request for such an indulgence was unreasonable; "for there is no new faith propagated in England; no religion set up but that which was commanded by our Saviour, preached by the primitive Church, and unanimously approved by the fathers of the best antiquity."

In 1570 A.D., Pope Pius V. published a bull of excommunication and deposition against the queen. In very warm language it called the queen an illegitimate usurper and a heretic, who had endeavoured to destroy the Catholic faith and practice; and it declared her deprived of her throne, her subjects absolved from their obedience to her, and forbidden to obey her under pain of excommunication. The bull was affixed to the gate of the English ambassador in Paris; and an enthusiast, John Felton, had the audacity to post a copy on the gate of the Bishop of London's palace, and was therefore seized and executed as a traitor.

The Romanist party at once ceased to attend their parish churches, their gentry began to send their children

abroad for education, foreign priests to come over on secret missions. France and Spain began a series of hostile operations, which at length culminated in the invasion of the Spanish Armada in 1588.

The Puritan party fought its battle more successfully than the Romanizing party. We have seen that it had a remarkable proportion of its friends in high office in the Church; it had also powerful protectors at court. It organized an opposition both in Convocation and in Parliament, and appealed to the passions of the mob in the towns. Its aims may be briefly stated to be these: the substitution of the Presbyterian form of Church government for Episcopacy, and the substitution of the doctrines and forms of worship of the foreign Calvinistic reformers for those of the Church of England. Finding themselves unable to subvert the Church, some extreme men began to establish a separate sect, the first Presbytery being set up at Wandsworth in 1573. Soon after, the Government interfered to silence some of the most vehement of the agitators.

The present Thirty-nine Articles were drawn up and received the assent of Convocation in January, 1563. The Council of Trent did not conclude its sessions and give authority to the Tridentine doctrines till the end of the same year. The Second Book of Homilies was put forth in 1571. A new version of the Bible under Parker's editing was published in 1568.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE PURITANS

THE reign of James I. may be lightly passed over. So far as our Church history is concerned, the early part of his reign was a continuation of the latter part of that of Elizabeth. But during his reign those political and religious forces were developed which came into collision during the next reign. In politics, while James and his courtiers were exalting the royal prerogative, ideas of parliamentary government were growing into shape among the people. In the Church, the Calvinistic theology and Puritanical principles of Church government were predominant among the bishops and in the Universities, but the Arminian reaction was already gaining ground among the clergy; and the doctrine of apostolical succession and the desire for a higher ritual was coming in.

The Synod of Dort may be taken as the turning point. The Arminian doctrines had made more way in Holland, the country of Arminius, than in England, and were there causing so much acrimonious discussion that the States-General caused a synod of Protestant divines to be held at Dort to consider them. James I. at their invitation sent three or four clergymen, of whom one was a bishop and another a deacon, to assist at the discussion. We may briefly state the opposing doctrines. Calvin's teaching on predestination may be summed up in what are called the Five Points. 1. Election: viz., that God from all eternity not only foresaw but also

decreed the fall of Adam, and the total corruption of his posterity; that He also from all eternity elected some of this fallen race to be saved, and others to be eternally lost. 2. Redemption: that Christ died for the elect only. 3. The bondage of the will: that man in his unregenerate state is deprived of his free will towards God. 4. Grace: that the non-elect are left without effectual grace. 5. Final perseverance: that the elect have grace given which is irresistible, and which they can never lose, and so they are certain of final salvation. The opposing teaching of Arminius is also set forth in Five Points, the substance of which is as follows: 1. That God decreed to bestow salvation on those whom He foresaw would believe on Jesus Christ, and persevere in faith and obedience. 2. That by Christ's death expiation was made for the sins of all men, but that none but believers will finally reap the benefit. 3. That as man is by nature born in sin, and unable to think or to do what is good, it is necessary for salvation that he must be born again and be renewed by the Holy Spirit. 4. That Divine grace is not invincible or necessarily effectual, but may be resisted by man's perverse will. 5. That a man may finally fall from a state of grace and salvation.

The divines of the predominant party at the synod conducted the proceedings with great unfairness towards the Arminian party. In the end the doctrines of Arminius were condemned. Barneveldt was executed, Hugo Grotius, one of the greatest scholars of his time, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and Arminian preachers were persecuted and exiled. This was a great triumph for the Calvinistic party in the Church of England. They claimed that this Church was bound by the decision of the Synod of Dort. Archbishop

Abbott, an austere Puritan and Calvinist, made his palace the head-quarters of that party, and used his power as licenser of the press to allow circulation to their publications, and his power in the High Commission Court to repress the clergy who did not agree with them. In the Universities successive professors of theology, and most of the heads of houses and tutors, were of the Puritan party. But a reaction had already set in, and the men were rising into observation who were shortly to revive the true principles of the Reformation. Laud, the President of St. John's, Oxford, was the leader of the increasing number of those who were opposed to the prevalent opinions.

We have already seen that the course which the foreign Reformers were driven unwillingly to take was the formation of new religious bodies outside the ancient Church. Our Reformers were able, by God's good providence, to reform the ancient national Church itself. The foreign bodies were thus driven to seek for a continuity of the Church of Christ, from the time of our Lord downward to themselves, not through the mediæval Church, from which they had seceded, and which they declared to be anti-Christ, but through isolated individuals and occasional groups of men who had held doctrines more or less opposed to the dominant doctrines of the Roman communion, and more or less resembling those of the reformed churches. Berengarius, the Waldenses, the Albigenses, the Wiclifites, were quoted as forming an invisible church of true believers which connected the Lutherans and the Calvinists by a spiritual descent with the Apostles and the Lord. The English Reformers had not been driven to any such expedient, and had steadily maintained that by no act of the reform did they cut themselves off from the unity of the visible

Church of Christ. One more quotation here, in addition to those given in a previous chapter, must suffice. In a letter which Henry VIII. caused to be addressed to Cardinal Pole, he says: "Ye suppose the king's grace to be severed from the unity of Christ's Church. . . . His full purpose and intent is to see the laws of Almighty God freely and sincerely preached and taught, and Christ's faith without blot kept and preserved in this realm; and not to separate himself from the unity of Christ's Catholic Church, but inviolably at all times to keep and observe the same, and to redeem his Church of England out of all captivity of foreign powers heretofore usurped therein into the Christian state that all Churches were in at the beginning; and to abolish and clearly put away such usurpations as heretofore in this realm the bishops of Rome have by many undue means increased to their great advantage."

The English Puritans, however, had abandoned their own sure and safe standing-ground, and had taken up the Church theory of the foreign Reformers.

The new school which sprang up in the middle of the reign of James I. took up again the safe ground of the great English Reformers, that the Reformation threw off the usurpations of Rome, asserting the original and rightful independence of the Church of England as the Church of Christ originally settled and continuously maintained in this country; and at the same time threw off the corruptions of doctrine and superstitious practices which had crept in in the course of ages and crusted over the true faith; restoring her doctrine and discipline to that of the primitive Church. Just as Archbishop Theodore, at the Synod of Hatfield, began by laying down the five general councils as the basis of the faith of the Church of England, so at the Reformation the

Reformers began by laying down the undisputed general councils as the basis of their work. They did not hesitate to trace their spiritual descent through the pre-Reformation Church. That Church held the whole faith and discipline of the primitive Church, overlaid with human additions, but the essentials of the Church were all there. The Scriptures were guarded uncorrupted, the essential doctrines of the faith held their place undisputed in the creeds, the prevalent errors, however grievous, did not, as Hooker says, directly overthrow or deny the foundation; and the modern reader must bear in mind that, though many erroneous opinions were widely held and taught, yet the authoritative declarations of the faith of the Church of England before the time of the Reformation, were very different from the authoritative definitions and novel dogmas which since the Reformation have been fastened upon the modern Romish Church.

So Bramhall, one of this new school of Anglo-Catholics, says: "I make not the least doubt in the world that the Church of England before the Reformation and after the Reformation are as much the same Church as a garden before it is weeded and after it is weeded; or a vine before it is pruned and after it is pruned and freed from the luxuriant branches is the same vine."

If it were necessary to trace a spiritual descent it would have been easy enough to show how in every generation there were thousands of men and women in the mediæval Church who had had a vital hold on the great doctrines of the Christian faith, and had led deeply spiritual lives. One evidence of it is seen in the devotional books which were written, and were popular, throughout the Middle Ages. We find in them traces of erroneous doctrines, such as invocation of the saints;

but we find in them also a pure spiritual religion, looking for pardon only through the precious blood, seeking for sanctification only through the Holy Spirit, and breathing the most fervent self-denying love for Jesus and for mankind. The 'Imitation of Christ,' one of the most popular devotional books of the present day, is the production of a 14th century monk, and was written specially for monks; and it is only one representative of a class of books, and of a type of Christian piety, which were common in the Middle Ages. The same ascetic spirit may be found among the Puritans themselves. In the earlier ascetics it existed together with some errors in doctrine and some superstitions; in the later Puritans it existed together with errors in doctrine of a different kind, and of a narrow, harsh, unloving tone of mind. It is difficult without a considerable and intimate knowledge of the people in the Middle Ages to say what the popular religion really was. The confusion of thought which attributes to all people previous to the Reformation a deliberate holding of the full-blown doctrines of the Council of Trent, is a manifest error. The truth is that there were wide gradations of belief and practice in the Middle Ages. Some went beyond the authoritative teaching of the Church, and were ignorant and superstitious; others held even its authoritative teaching with reservations. Nobody thought of separating from the Church in those ages; but there was a good deal of freedom in religious opinions tolerated within the Church. In the 13th century Bishop Grostête is a type of many others who brought the Roman doctrine to the test of Scripture and the Fathers, and rejected what was seen to be contrary to them. In the 14th century the popular tone of thought indicated in Chaucer's 'Canterbury Tales' and 'Piers Plough-

man's Creed' was not ultra-papal. The 15th century was in some respects more Papal than earlier times; but the Councils of Constance and Basle are enough to remind us how strenuously Christendom sought to throw off the Papal tyranny and to reform itself.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE GREAT REBELLION

CHARLES I. came to the throne at a period which was one of political transition throughout Europe. The power of the great nobles was broken; the feudal system was obsolete; the middle class had become powerful; the ancient constitution could not continue as it was; Parliament now could not be dealt with as it was by Henry and Elizabeth. Either the king's prerogative must be extended, and Charles become as absolute as the kings of France and Spain, or the people must grow politically powerful and exercise a real control over the government.

The struggle between the king and the Parliament did not begin in any design or endeavour on the part of the king to deprive Parliament of any power, or the people of any liberty, which they formerly possessed. No doubt he intended to continue to govern according to the principles of royal prerogative which had been acted upon since the reign of Henry VII., but he intended to govern justly and well the people whom he believed that God had placed under his rule. On the other hand there can be no doubt that there was a party in the kingdom which understood the political situation, and which had deliberately resolved to aim at the limitation of the royal prerogative and the exaltation of the power of Parliament. We can sympathize with both sides:—with the king, conscious of good intentions;

met in a spirit of antagonism by his first Parliament; his government thwarted and embarrassed; and his sense of what was due to his person and office offended, without his having given any cause for it. We can sympathize with the English spirit which had resolved not to sink without a struggle into the condition of France or Spain; not to leave liberties at the chance of the good disposition of the sovereign; but to secure constitutional guarantees for personal freedom and good government. It is not our part to give the civil history of the great rebellion. Our business is only with its religious aspect.

The Puritan party, which had been growing in influence since the time of Elizabeth, had carefully cultivated an influence in Parliament, and allied itself with the constitutional party. The Church party in the late reign had strenuously maintained the royal prerogative; and some of its divines had preached doctrine on the Divine right of kings and the duty of passive obedience, which we read now with amazement and disapproval.

But though we sympathize with the actors on both sides in this great tragedy, we must with equal impartiality disapprove of many of their acts. In the early part of the struggle the king and his advisers do not seem to have quite comprehended the nature of the struggle they were engaged in; when they did understand it they did not set themselves to try to find a constitutional equilibrium between the royal prerogative and the popular power, but deliberately endeavoured to exalt the prerogative, to copy the example of France and Spain, and make the king absolute. We can understand their belief that a monarchy was the form of government best suited to give England prosperity and happiness at home, and security and dignity among

the nations, and that the proceedings of its assailants would, if successful, destroy the monarchy, and reduce the kingdom to anarchy and ruin. But, as Englishmen of the 19th century, we cannot wish that the attempt of Strafford and Laud had been successful. On the other hand, while we cannot but sympathize with the general resolve to secure a settled constitution, we must utterly disapprove of the fierce personal bitterness which actuated some of the leaders of the movement, and the unscrupulousness of their strategy. We must recognize the fact that they were not willing to stop at a constitutional equilibrium. If the final propositons of the Parliament had been accepted by the king, they "would," as Hobbes says, "have made the English government a commonwealth with a king *under* them."

At length, after fifteen years' experience, the king seems to have become convinced of the impossibility of carrying out his plan of making the monarchy absolute, and to have summoned the Long Parliament with the honest[1] resolve to submit to give constitutional guarantees. In the first session of that Parliament he formally abandoned all the encroachments which had been made on the ancient rights and liberties of the people; he granted further guarantees which made those rights and liberties more ample, better defined, and more secure than ever before. "There was not," says Hume, "a public or private grievance but what was redressed within the first nine months of this session." The death of Strafford on the scaffold was looked upon by the nation as the seal of the king's recantation and reconciliation with his people. But a party in the nation had now resolved

[1] Hume shows that the modern charges against Charles, of insincerity and untrustworthiness, were not brought against him in his lifetime, and are not borne out by the facts.

on more than securing a constitutional monarchy. When the second session of this Long Parliament opened it was at once clear that Parliament itself, hitherto so unanimous, was now divided into two parties: one party which was satisfied with the balanced constitution in Church and State which had been wrung from the king, and another party which was resolved to make the House of Commons supreme over king and peers. With the latter was the whole Puritan party, which desired to make a corresponding change in the constitution of the Church, to establish the Presbyterian form of Church government, and the Calvinistic scheme of doctrine. Henceforth the struggle is not between the king and the people, but between limited monarchy and the Church on one side, and the Parliamentary and Presbyterian party on the other—between Cavalier and Roundhead. The latter were resolved to go the length of civil war to obtain their aims; the former were equally resolved to defend in arms the monarchy and the Church. At last the House voted that an army should be raised for the defence of the Parliament. The king set up his standard at Nottingham. The first battle was fought at Edgehill, Oct. 23, 1642. The civil war lasted nine years. During the first year the king's cause prospered, but at the battle of Naseby (in 1645) the regiment of "Ironsides," commanded by Col. Cromwell, by its valour and discipline turned the fortune of the fight, and Cromwell at once acquired a great influence. The Parliamentary army was remodelled on the pattern of the Ironsides; and, though Fairfax was nominally made its general, Cromwell became its virtual chief.

At length the king's cause being everywhere ruined, he escaped from Oxford and surrendered to the Scots army near Newark, May, 1646. They sold him to Parliament

for £40,000, raised by the sale of the bishops' lands. Parliament proceeded to negotiate a peace, and talked of disbanding the army, which they had learnt to fear. But it was too late, the army had become the master. Cromwell seized the king's person, and marched to London. On December 5, 1648, the House declared in favour of a reconciliation with the king. On the following day it was beset by a guard, forty-seven members were sent to prison, ninety-six who could not be depended upon were expelled; and the remainder, about fifty in number, contemptuously called "the Rump," voted (December, 1648) for the trial of the king. The king was executed January 30, 1649. Cromwell became for nearly ten years ruler of England.

In 1653 Cromwell forcibly dismissed the remnant ("Rump") of the Long Parliament, and summoned another (the "Barebones Parliament") of his own nominees, who voted him Governor for life, with the title of Lord Protector. Cromwell then dissolved the Parliament, divided the country into districts, over each of which he placed a major-general, and ruled England by the strong hand.

The religious history of the period as a whole divides itself into three clearly-marked periods. The king and the Church stood and fell together; the rule of the Parliament in the State carried with it the predominance of Presbyterianism in religion; and the triumph of Cromwell over the Parliament was the triumph of the Independents over the Presbyterians.

At the beginning of the Long Parliament a Committee of Religion was appointed, and the assault on the Church went on *pari passu* with that on the monarchy. The first attack was upon the bishops. At the very beginning

of the session Archbishop Laud was impeached, together with Strafford, and committed to the Tower, and the Church was thus deprived of the head round which it would have rallied, and of the ablest statesman for the organization and conduct of its defence. After petitions to Parliament, and violent speeches against the bishops, the House of Commons in March passed a bill to take away the bishops' votes in the House of Lords, but it was rejected by the Lords.

In 1640, thirteen of the bishops were impeached by the Commons for making canons in Convocation, and granting a benevolence to the king. But the action of the Convocation was so incontestably legal that the impeachment was allowed to drop. Following up their attack a little later, the Commons addressed a remonstrance to the king against the bishops and the "corrupt part" of the clergy. The passions of the people were stirred up against them; their dress made them easily recognized, and they were mobbed and threatened on going down to the House; in the House itself they were treated with discourtesy by some of the peers. At length, on December 29, 1641, the bishops sent in a formal paper, stating that they were prevented by the violence of the mob from attending in their places in the House, and protesting against all that was done in their absence. The bishops were again impeached for this protest and committed to the Tower. They were, however, bailed out and never brought to trial. But Parliament passed a bill to take away their votes, and the king, hoping to remove a cause of popular feeling against the Church, assented to the bill. The Commons at length openly avowed their determination never to accede to any terms of reconciliation with the king until the bill for the total eradication of episcopacy should have passed the Upper House. The bill,

therefore, was passed. But the king refused his assent. Parliament tried in vain to bribe him by offering to invest all episcopal lands in his person. The Church, by Archbishop Williams, proposed a bill for the reformation of the episcopate, but that was not what was desired, and it came to nothing.

In February, 1643, Parliament passed an ordinance for the sequestration of the revenues of bishops, deans, and chapters, and of other delinquents, to be employed in the defence of the Commonwealth. In June in the same year (1643), an assembly of divines was convened at Westminster—a kind of irregular synod—to advise Parliament on the settlement of the religious question. A few Churchmen were placed upon it, but seldom attended its sittings ; the majority were Presbyterians, and five were Independents who had returned from exile in Holland.

In the first year of the war the arms of the king were so successful that the rebels became alarmed, and the leaders were meditating a flight to the Continent, when an agreement was effected with the Scots, which engaged them to send an army into England to the aid of their brethren. One of the conditions of the agreement was that the English Parliament should adopt the Solemn League and Covenant, which bound by oath those who subscribed it to extirpate popery and prelacy, that is, to establish the Presbyterian form of Church government. This Covenant was pressed upon the clergy, and all who refused it had their livings and their private property sequestrated. Ever since the commencement of the Parliament the Committee of Religion had been engaged in ejecting "scandalous and malignant" ministers. Thousands were thus driven from their benefices, of whom we shall speak more fully presently.

In October, 1644, an ordinance was passed authorizing

presbyters to ordain ministers, and all so ordained were to be held as legal ministers of the Church of England.

Archbishop Laud having been three years in the Tower, was at length brought to trial for high treason. As the leader of the reaction against the prevalent Puritanism of the reign of James I., and head of the Anglo-Catholic school in the reign of Charles, the popular prejudice was greatly excited against him. As a minister he no doubt shared the political views of the king, and cordially acted with Strafford. His part as archbishop was to stem the tide of Puritanism, which was rising to drown the Church, and which, as we have seen, was mixed up with the political party opposed to the monarchy. We are no more concerned to defend all the archbishop's acts than we are those of the king. But we can do justice to his character. He was a man of learning and piety; a man of ability too, but deficient in tact and temper. He trusted too much in his honest intentions and straightforward vigour, and neglected policy and prudence. The two great charges against him were Romanizing and cruelty towards the Nonconformists. He was undoubtedly a High Churchman, and the popular prejudice against such men ran far higher in that day even than it has done in this; he had a hearty dislike of Puritanism, and with his blunt honesty took no pains to conceal it; but he was not a Romanizer. He himself appealed to the published account of his able controversy with the Jesuit Fisher as an honest statement of his views and a sufficient evidence of his orthodoxy. He was, no doubt, one of the judges in the tyrannical courts of Star Chamber and High Commission, but there is evidence that his vote was often given for a mitigation of the penalties which the courts inflicted. When brought to trial, although seventy-two years of age, and broken by his long imprisonment, he

defended himself with great spirit and ability. The judges declared that the charges against him did not amount to high treason; whereupon the Commons, as in the case of Strafford, proceeded by the tyrannical method of a bill of attainder. It was passed in the Lords at a sitting of twelve, or, as another authority says, of seven members; and the aged archbishop was beheaded on January 10, 1645.

On the same day that the Lords agreed to the attainder of Laud they passed the ordinance which forbade the use of the Prayer Book in Divine worship, and ordered the use of the Presbyterian Directory. A few months after, it was found necessary to enforce this by penalties. The date on which the ordinance came into force is worthy of note; it was on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1645, that Churchmen ceased to be at liberty to worship God according to their own conscience, even in the bosom of their families. For the ordinance enacted a penalty upon any one using the Book of Common Prayer either in public or private; it was £5 for the first offence, £10 for the second, and a year's imprisonment without bail for the third, and all copies of the Prayer Book were to be given up. At the same time it required all ministers to use the Directory, under a penalty of 40*s.* for each omission; and whoever ventured to speak against the Directory was to be fined not less than £5, or more than £50.

In 1646 an ordinance was passed for settling the Presbyterian form of government for three years, to be prolonged if Parliament should think fit. The Assembly of Divines published a Confession of Faith, and a Larger and Lesser Catechism founded upon it; and this was followed shortly after by an ordinance for abolishing the office of bishops and selling their lands.

On the establishment of Presbyterianism the Independents, who were rapidly growing more numerous and influential, petitioned for toleration, and an elaborate interchange of arguments took place between the two parties. The Presbyterian reasons for refusing toleration are worth noting, *e.g.* that "the gathering of separate churches out of true churches is repugnant to the will of God," and that "in countenance of this liberty there is not the least example in all the Holy Scripture": that "if a Church requires that which is evil of any member he must forbear compliance, but yet without separation." In reply to the offer of occasional communion with the established religion, they say that if the objectors "can exercise these acts of communion with them once or twice or thrice without sinning, they cannot see any reason why they cannot always communicate with them without sin: and if so, separation and church gathering would be unnecessary. To separate from those churches ordinarily and openly with whom we may occasionally join without sin seems a most unjust separation."

When the king surrendered to the Scots, and the Scots sold him to Parliament, the Parliamentary and Presbyterian party seemed to have triumphed. The Parliament had crushed all opposition, and held the king its prisoner. Episcopacy had been abolished, the Church clergy turned out, the Prayer Book silenced; the Presbyterian system had been established, and the Universities and benefices and schools were filled by ministers of that persuasion.

A contemporary historian (Dugdale) sums up the political situation in these words: "Thus the Presbyterians having embroiled the kingdom, kindled and carried on a calamitous war, during which more seats were plundered and burnt, more churches robbed and

profaned, more blood spilt within the compass of four years; and in short more frightful scenes opened of savage slaughter and confusion, than had been acted in the long contest between the Houses of York and Lancaster; the Presbyterians, I say, after having thrown their country into all this misery and convulsion, met with nothing but infamy and disappointment. For after having wrested the sword out of the king's hands, and brought the rebellion to their wishes, when they thought of nothing less than dividing the prey and raising vast fortunes out of Crown and Church lands, their hopes were suddenly scattered; they were turned out of their scandalous acquisitions, and publicly exposed to contempt and scorn. For now the Independents forced them to retire from Westminster, seized their posts, and made themselves masters upon the matter both in Church and State."

The contemporary Puritan writer, Edwards, gives a summary of the religious situation in a book entitled 'Gangrena,' which he dedicated to the two Houses of Parliament, and in which he recites the evils which had broken out in the last four years (viz., from 1642 to 1646): "Things every day," he says, "grow worse and worse; you can hardly imagine them so bad as they are. No kind of blaspheming, heresie, disorder, and confusion, but 'tis found among us, or coming in upon us. For we, instead of reformation, are grown from one extreme to another, fallen from Scylla to Charybdis; from popish innovations, superstitions, and prelatical tyranny, to damnable heresies, horrid blasphemies, libertinism, and fearful anarchy . . . .; the worst of the prelates, in the midst of many popish Arminian tenets and popish innovations, held many sound doctrines and had many commendable practices; yea, the very papists hold and

keep to many articles of faith and truths of God, have some order among them, encourage learning, have certain fixed principles of truth, with practices of devotion and good works; but many of the sects and sectaries of our days deny all principle of religion, are enemies to all holy duties, order, learning, overthrowing all. . . . . What swarms are there of all sorts of illiterate mechanic preachers, yea, of women and boy-preachers! . . . . These sectaries have been growing upon us ever since the first year of our sitting, and have every year increased more and more."

When Cromwell attained power the Independents attained ecclesiastical supremacy also. They did not proscribe the Presbyterians, but the Presbyterian scheme of Church government was tacitly suspended. The statutes against Dissenters were repealed, not that the Independents believed in universal toleration more than anybody else did in those days, but the Presbyterians were still too powerful to be proscribed. Anabaptists were tolerated, and the Jews were permitted to settle in the kingdom; but Churchmen and Quakers, Roman Catholics and Unitarians, were treated more rigorously than ever.

In 1654, a committee of five Tryers was appointed to examine all candidates for the ministry, and their certificate served for ordination and letters of orders. At the same time commissioners were appointed, a considerable number in every county, to search out scandalous and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters, and the benefices and schools were swept of the last few men who might have contrived to linger on under the protection of a friendly squire, or through the affection of their old parishioners.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE SUFFERINGS OF THE CLERGY

THE Church of England has never taken any pains to keep alive the memory of its sufferings during the great rebellion, but we should leave our subject incomplete, and omit one of the great lessons which past history has to teach the present age, if we did not give, with such prominence and in such detail as to produce an adequate impression on the reader's mind, some account of the persecution of the clergy by the Puritans during the twenty years whose general history has been sketched in the last chapter.

Soon after the Long Parliament assembled it appointed a Committee of Religion, which was commonly called the Committee of Scandalous Ministers. This committee appointed other committees in every county of England for the purpose of receiving accusations against the loyal clergy. A paper was issued inviting "all ingenuous persons in every county of the kingdom to be very active to improve the present opportunity." Afterwards other papers were published setting forth that "it is found by sad experience that parishioners are not forward to complain of their ministers," and appointing therefore paid agents—common informers—to go about and get up accusations against them; a trade which was vulgarly called parson-hunting. Presently accusations poured in fast enough. The charges may be divided into three classes. First, charges which amount to

nothing more than that the clergy observed the rites and ceremonies and preached the doctrines of the Church of England, which, in the language of the Committee of Religion, was superstition and false doctrine. The second class of charges was to the effect that the accused was in favour of the Royal cause and unfavourable to that of the Parliament, which they called malignity. And with these were very commonly found a third class of charges of immorality of various kinds. We are not prepared to deny that there may have been some immoral men in so large a body; but in the case of the great majority of the ejected clergy there is no doubt that the former causes, orthodoxy and loyalty, were the real causes of their persecution; the last-named was a device to make them odious in the sight of men; as Dugdale says, "Their enemies put this charge upon them, as the ancient pagans put skins of wild beasts upon the holy martyrs, to make the dogs worry them."

The accusation of two or three of the most disreputable characters in a parish, or even of one person, was enough to put a clergyman on his trial before one of the committees. The accusation was not required to be proved on oath, the committees not administering an oath in any instance. The accused had nothing like a fair trial, but something much more like a drum-head court-martial. And every orthodox and loyal clergyman who was brought before them, however high his character for learning, piety, diligence in his duties, or acceptableness to his people, was certain to be condemned. The fate of the condemned was various. Some, to avoid ill-treatment and imprisonment, left their livings and fled to places which were in the possession of the king's friends—so long as any places still held out for the king—and afterwards escaped abroad or to Virginia. Others,

less fortunate, were arrested and imprisoned. The jails were filled, and hulks were used as places of imprisonment. There was talk at one time of relieving the overcrowded prisons by selling the prisoners as slaves to the American plantations or to the Algerines. Rigby, one of the members of Parliament, actually entered into a contract for their sale with two merchants, and twice brought before the House of Commons a motion that they should be sold; and it was commonly believed that some of the many who were imprisoned on ship-board in the various ports were thus got rid of. Many escaped more easily; they were merely plundered in house and barn and turned out. It was a standing order, indeed, that the ejected clergyman should have a fifth of his benefice for the maintenance of himself and his family, and house-room in the parsonage. And in a few cases we find the parson's family living in the barn or the kitchen, while the intruder occupied the rest of the house; but in most cases the parson and his family were turned out altogether, and had to seek refuge where they could. We hear of one or two taking refuge in the church-tower or porch. The fifth of a benefice, then as now, however regularly paid, would hardly keep a family from starving; and it would seem to have been very rarely the case that the ejected clergy could recover their fifths. In two cases which Walker[1] gives, the poor parson was told to go and thresh for a living. In another the intruder put two spinning-wheels out of the window, and told the parson to let his daughters spin. In another, when the wife applied, the intruder would not pay, because for anything he knew her husband was dead; and when the husband applied in person he was refused with grave irony on the ground that he was

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy.'

indeed dead—in trespasses and sins. When one poor woman pleaded that she and her children were starving, she was told that "starving was as near a way to heaven as any other."

But besides these sufferings which the clergy endured by process of law—or what passed for law—very many of them had also to endure plunder and ill-treatment at the hands of the mob and the Parliament soldiery, before the legal end came. In the towns venerable clergymen of unpopular opinions were frequently mobbed and maltreated. It was quite a common incident for the mob of a neighbouring town, or a troop of horse, to amuse themselves on a Sunday by going to pull some loyal clergyman out of his pulpit and make a riot in his church; or suddenly to invade a country clergyman's house, plunder and destroy his goods, empty the feathers out of the beds in order to fill the bed-ticks with corn out of his tithe barn, to steal his horses to carry off the booty, and to finish by ill-treating the parson and his family, wounding, and in some instances inflicting death. And for all this robbery and violence they seem to have been unable to obtain redress. Walker gives cases in which the magistrates refused to listen to their complaints. Thus were the bishops and dignitaries, masters and fellows and scholars of colleges, clergy and schoolmasters of the Church of England, plundered, harassed, dragooned, ejected, imprisoned, and persecuted to the number of 8000 men. Perhaps the most striking and suggestive fact illustrative of the extent of their subsequent suffering in poverty and privation, is this, that when Charles II. was restored to the throne, and the loyal gentry to their estates, and the ejected clergy to their livings, out of the 8000 who had been turned out, there were only 800 to claim their own again.

A few examples will illustrate this general description.

The Rev. Mr. Sefton was rector of Burton-cum-Coates in Sussex. "The chief occasion of his sufferings was by continuing to preach up loyalty and obedience to the king after the rebellion broke out, for which he was threatened with imprisonment; notwithstanding which he boldly persisted in the discharge of his duty until Sir John Fagg, a colonel in the rebel army, came with a troop of horse to apprehend him; but Mr. Sefton, having timely notice of it, fled and absconded for almost half a year, in a poor lodge belonging to a warren, whither a poor boy, under pretence of carrying victuals to the servants which worked upon a neighbouring farm, brought him his meals. After he had lain concealed there about five or six months, he fled to the East Indies, from whence he lived to return before the usurpation; and repairing again to his living, was, upon the news of his being come back, sought after a second time by a great man of those parts, who, missing of him (notwithstanding the care and pains he had taken to come over the hedges to his house by a back way), went into his study and rifled it, &c. He was a very learned and pious man, and was succeeded in the times of confusion by an illiterate mechanical fellow."[1]

"The Rev. John Phare was curate of Whimple in Devonshire. He was turned out, together with his patron, by a troop of horse which came to give institution to the intruding successor. He was also forced to fly for his safety. He had afterwards the impropriate curacy of Bradninch, in that neighbourhood, where he had likewise got a considerable school, both which he was deprived of for refusing the Covenant, although he had at that time seven children, no temporal estate, or

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 372.

any other means of subsistence; and was forced to fly a second time and abscond for fear of imprisonment. After some time he returned and lived at Bradninch, and preached now and then where he could get a pulpit and ten shillings towards the support of his necessitous family; but his chief subsistence was in the charity of the neighbouring gentry. His eldest son (from whom I have this account) is now living in Exeter, and hath assured me that himself, being the best able of all the children, used to go with a bag at his back and beg for the family—receiving from one a loaf, from another a cheese, &c., which he saith he continued to do until he and his brother were bound apprentices to the employ of a taylor, in which he is now very poor. He adds that he and his brothers were always very glad when their father could carry them to any gentleman's house, that they might fill their bellies. His immediate successor at Bradninch was one Lee, an Independent, who treated him with all imaginable spight and malice," of which some examples are given. "Mr. Phare was a good scholar and a man of good life. I had almost forgot to mention that his house was once plundered, and that he outlived the usurpation." [1]

The Rev. John Tarleton was vicar of Ilminster in Somersetshire. "He was turned out of doors with his wife and four children, one of which was at that time sick; and [the sick child] was by the charity of an innkeeper, together with another of them, taken in and lodged that night, but the rest of the family lay in the shambles. . . . At the same time Mr. Tarleton's books and all his goods were plundered, most of which were possest by Mr. Timothy Batt, the intruder, who had not the conscience to pay for them, although he forgot not

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 420.

to carry them away with him when he removed from Ilminster. Mr. Tarleton and his family being thus turned out of doors and forced to be on the streets, as is before said, because most of the neighbours were not only afraid to take them into their houses, but would not venture so much as to relieve them, lest their own families should be used in the same manner."[1]

The Rev. Thomas Tyllot, rector of Deepden, Suffolk, "was shut up in a close dungeon with several other clergymen, where they were most barbarously treated, having nothing to lie on in the midst of winter, and just enough allowed them to preserve them alive. He was detained in prison nine months. Who they were or how many that succeeded to his livings, I know not; but this is certain, that two of them who had Deepden (if I mistake not) successively could not write either sense or English, as the parish register at this day testifieth."[2]

The allowance which was made to them for their subsistence in prison was a penny a day, as we learn from the story of the Rev. James Buck, B.D., vicar of Stradbrook, Suffolk. "About the beginning of the rebellion, when he had been vicar here upwards of twenty years, he was seized and carry'd to Ipswich jayl, in which durance he was for a time allowed part of the proceeds of his vicaridge; but in a while he had news brought him that he was no longer to expect anything from Stradbrook, whereupon he acquainted the master of the prison that he must live upon the allowance of the country, for he had nothing wherewith to subsist. This the jailor told him could never be, for the utmost allowance was but a penny per diem for bread, and water to drink. As this was the condition God's providence had reduced

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 381. [2] Ibid., p. 383.

him to, he resolved to submit to it; and did for two months together live on bread and water."[1]

The Rev. Richard Sterne, then rector of Yeovilton in Somersetshire, and afterwards Archbishop of York, gives an account of his own imprisonment, in a letter to a friend who had offered to lend him money for his need. "This is now the fourth (? fifteenth) month of my imprisonment: nineteen weeks in the Tower, thirty weeks in the Lord Petre's house, ten days in the ships, and seven weeks here in Ely House. The very dry fees and rents of these several prisons have amounted to £100, besides diet and all other charges, which have been various and expensive, as in prisons is usual. . . . They have seized upon all my means which they can lay their hands on . . . . so that if my friend's love had not made my credit better than it deserves to be and supplied my occasions, I should have kept me a hungry and cold house both here and at home. And all this while I have never been so much as spoken withal, or called either to prove or to receive an account why I am here. Nor is anything laid to my charge (not so much as the general crime of being a malignant); no, not in the warrant of my commitment. What hath been wanting in human justice hath been (I praise God!) supplied by Divine mercy. Health of body, and patience and cheerfulness of mind I have not wanted; no, not on shipboard, where we lay (the first night) without anything under or over us but the bare decks and the clothes on our backs; and after we had some of us got beds were not able (when it rain'd) to be dry on them, and when it was fair weather were sweltered with heat and stifled with our own breaths, there being of us in that one small Ipswich coal-ship (so low built, too, that we could not stand upright in it)

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 210.

within one or two of threescore, whereof six were knights and eight doctors in divinity, and divers gentlemen of very good worth, that would have been sorry to have seen their servants (nay, their dogs) no better accommodated. Yet among all that company I do not remember that I saw one sad or dejected countenance all the while; so strong is God when we are weakest."[1]

In the account of the Rev. Richard Powell, of Spaxton Rectory, Somersetshire, we are told that "at the same time the Parliament army possessed Taunton, and when this clergyman repaired to his own house, he was forced to place people to watch whether any of the Parliament army was coming, who had often searched his house, and thrust their swords through his beds, to find him. When Bridgwater was delivered up to the Parliament, all those clergymen that would not take the Covenant were driven away on foot to Portsmouth, and amongst them was this Mr. Powell; and there they were put on board a ship to be carried to London."

Here is one example out of many of the violence which the clergy had to suffer at the hands of the mob, whose passions had been roused by those in higher places. The Rev. Gabriel Honifield, B.D., vicar of Ardley, near Colchester, "was forced to resign his living in 1642 by the barbarous usage and treatment which he met with. He lived at that time in Colchester, the mob of which place in one of their grand rounds rifled his house of all its furniture, took away his bonds, bills, and evidences, and left not a shelf behind them, or a peg to hang a hat on. Upon this the old gentleman goes to the mayor and makes his complaint; but instead of finding any redress, one of the aldermen then present told him that he wondered he would offer to come abroad, being

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 370.

a man so much hated; and so rated him away. In his return he was followed through the streets with shouts and hootings, and, what is much worse, with dirt and stones; so little did either the hoary head and venerable age of this grave person, then seventy years old, or the privilege of his sacred function, afford him protection from the enraged multitude. In this manner he passed on some part of the way, till at length a kinsman of his ventured to open his doors and give him shelter; upon which the rabble threatened to pull down the house, and would no question have been as good as their word, had not the good old gentleman, to save his kinsman's family, exposed himself a second time to their fury, and suffered them to pursue him again with their clamour through the streets, which they did with such outrages and insults that he was at length forced to take the common jayl for his sanctuary."[1]

Assaults upon the clergy while ministering in church were quite common. Here are two or three taken from only one page[2] of the authority we have followed throughout this chapter. The Rev. Mr. Wild "was curate of St. Michael's, Cornhill, in London; assaulted and beaten in the church, and turned out." The Rev. Mr. Weyborough "was minister of Stoke in Worcestershire, and had like to have been murdered by one of the Parliament officers, who beset the church with a body of horse, came himself into it, and fired his pistol at Mr. Weyborough as he was reading the service." "The Rev. Oliver Whitby was curate to Dr. King, the suffering Bishop of Chichester, at the rich living of Petworth, and being a loyalist was often in danger of his life by the fanaticks, one of which shot at him with a pistol while he was preaching in Petworth pulpit,

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 264. [2] Ibid., p. 424.

but missed him; upon which, to avoid further danger, he escaped to a poor house nigh Petworth, and lived there six months privately; but being discovered by the rebels, he was forced to take his lodging for several days in a hollow tree, which the old woman had showed him, and there fed by her a long time on a pretence of her going to gather wood. He lived in great want till the Restoration, and was then preferred in Chichester Church."

In the above extracts out of a folio book of 436 pages we have not taken the worst examples of persecution we could find, but such as would give a fair impression of what the loyal and orthodox clergy generally had, with their families, to suffer at the hands of their Presbyterian and Independent persecutors. It would have been easy to make a selection of examples which would have shown that this volume of the Book of Martyrs is not without its horrid streaks and traces of fire and blood. For example: The Rev. Alexander Randall, "coming home in the night, in the winter time, a little before the king's murther, the house was beset by the rebel soldiers, as soon almost as he was enter'd; and the maid-servant opened the back-door while he was escaping out of the fore-door, and the soldiers entering shot him in the dark-light, and he fell dead over the threshold of the fore-door; and then they drew him in and threw him before his wife, saying to her, 'There is the old rogue, and thou shalt be served the same if thou dost not give us the keys;' and so carried away all linen and plate and all that was valuable; and the wench that opened the door fled, and was never seen there more, and was suspected therefore to have betrayed her master. These are the words of his own niece."[1]

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 422.

Again, in the account of the Rev. Roger Clark, rector of Todoer in Dorsetshire, we read that a troop of horse surrounded the house at midnight to take his son, who, however, escaped out of the window and got away. "Then the doors being opened, they took the said Roger Clark the father, and bound him neck and heels, at the age of seventy, till the blood came forth of his eyes, and carried him immediately afterwards to Sturminster-Newton Castle in Dorset; and not confessing anything of his son's design, they burnt his fingers with matches, of which torture he was about half a year of recovering."[1]

It will be seen in the next chapter in what manner the Church revenged herself on her persecutors when at length she was restored to power.

[1] Walker's 'Sufferings of the Clergy,' p. 414.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE RESTORATION

THE political liberty for the sake of which some had sternly shed the blood of kings, had utterly fled. The Parliamentarians had succumbed to the Republicans, and the Republicans had succumbed to the Man of the Sword—it is the well-known order of political change—and Cromwell for ten years had ruled England despotically, supported by the army. In these days the mists of personal passion have dispersed and cleared away, and we can see clearly and judge calmly of the men and the times. Cromwell was a man of great genius; he ruled England firmly, and made her respected abroad. But, though the people dared not resist, they groaned under his iron despotism. The majority of the nobles and gentry, who were cavaliers and Churchmen, had been despoiled by sequestration and fine, and were forbidden the exercise of their religion, and cursed in their hearts the tyranny against which they dared not raise their voices. The few nobles and gentry who were Parliamentarians and Presbyterians, hated and feared only a few degrees less this successful soldier, who in the hour of their triumph had robbed them of its fruits, had literally turned their Parliament out of doors with contempt, and filled the pulpits of their parishes with fanatical soldiers, mechanics, Muggletonians, Anabaptists, and Fifth Monarchy men. The majority of the people were humiliated by enforced submission to a govern

ment towards which they felt no loyalty; shocked at the religious confusion and wild fanaticism; and disgusted with the artificial severity of manners which prevailed. In short, the people had been made the subject of various interesting experiments in government and religion, and the proof of the failure of them all was that the whole people were longing for a return to the ancient monarchy and the ancient Church. Neither of these had been perfect, but they were better a thousand times over than the Parliament and Presbytery, or than Cromwell and the Independents.

When Cromwell died, the land held its breath in suspense. His son Richard Cromwell was allowed to succeed quietly. But some of the ambitious comrades of the Usurper began to agitate. The country seemed on the eve of a series of revolutions in which the armies would dispose of the prize of absolute power, for which ambitious generals would intrigue and bribe and fight. Monk's patriotism saved the nation. The favourite general of the army of the north, he was himself one of the likeliest candidates for power. He marched southward and entered London without giving any clue to his intentions. He studied the disposition of the people, who were almost as cautious and silent as himself. He invited the surviving members of the old Long Parliament, which had never been legally dissolved, to reassemble. He waited until a few sittings enabled him to conclude that the Parliament shared the feelings of the nation. Then on May 1, 1660, he caused the President of the Council to inform them that one Sir John Granville, a servant of the king's, had been sent over by his Majesty and waited at the door with a letter to the Commons. The news was received with loud acclamations. Sir John Granville was called

in. The letter, accompanied by a declaration, was greedily read. Without a moment's delay, without a contradictory vote, a committee was appointed to prepare an answer; and to spread the same satisfaction throughout the kingdom, it was ordered that the letter and declaration should immediately be published. The people, long kept in a state of intense anxiety, burst out into the wildest manifestations of joy at the prospect of the Restoration. Traditions remain of some who died of emotion when informed of the happy tidings. Not a voice was raised against it.

Richard Cromwell, a quiet, unambitious man, retired cheerfully into private life; the discontented soldiery and fanatics in London were overawed by Monk's troops. The navy did not wait for the decision of Parliament to declare in favour of the king. The more prudent, who would have taken the opportunity to make conditions with the monarchy, were not listened to. On the 8th of May, the two Houses attended while Charles II. was proclaimed in Palace Yard, at Whitehall, and at Temple Bar. The king disembarked at Dover on the 29th of May, and made his progress to London, through a lane of rejoicing people, and re-entered Whitehall; while all over the country the church bells rang, fountains ran wine, bonfires blazed, and the people shouted, with the pent-up loyalty of a dozen years, "God save the King!"

The Presbyterians had sent a deputation of divines to Breda, to try to obtain from the king his support of their views. The king received them kindly, said that he had no intention to impose hard conditions and to embarrass consciences; but that the Parliament was the best judge what indulgence and toleration was necessary to the repose of the kingdom. When they pressed him

to set the example of not having the surplice or the Common Prayer used in his own chapel, he replied with some spirit that he had all along retained the service and ritual of the Church of England in his exile; that though he was willing for the present to connive at disorder and tolerate a failure of solemnity and decorum in religious worship, yet he would never abet any such irregularity in his own practice, nor discountenance the ancient and laudable customs of the Church in which he was bred.

When the king came to his own again, the dispossessed nobles resumed their estates as a matter of course, and the survivors of the clergy returned to their livings. Nine bishops had survived to be restored; but out of about 9500 parishes there were only about 800 claimants for their old benefices. The rest of the occupants of the livings were left unmolested until some settlement of ecclesiastical affairs should be arrived at. In very many places the Common Prayer was at once resumed, in some the Directory still continued to be used.

In pursuance of the king's promises a conference was held at the Savoy in 1661 between some of the bishops on one side and some of the leading Nonconformists on the other, in the hope of making such modifications in the government and ritual of the Church as might lead to the comprehension of the great body of the Nonconformists. The result was not satisfactory. No concessions which the Church party were prepared to make would really have satisfied the extreme Nonconformists, and it was not desirable to make alterations which would have been offensive to Churchmen without any hope of conciliating opponents. Some of the suggestions made by the Nonconformist divines were

adopted, and the opportunity was taken to introduce some other improvements; they were numerous, but not of sufficient importance to be detailed in such a sketch as this. It is enough to say here that the Epistles and Gospels were ordered to be read out of the Authorized Version, but the Psalms were left in Coverdale's version. The Sentences, Exhortation, and Confession were prefixed to the Evening Prayer; and the Prayer for Parliament, for all sorts and conditions of men, the General Thanksgiving, and other occasional prayers and special collects, were added. A few alterations must be noticed as indicating a distinct reaction in the mind of the Church from the standard of the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. towards that of the first book; *e.g.* in the Office for Baptism, the words "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin," were inserted; in the Prayer for the Church Militant mention was introduced of the departed ("We also bless Thy holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear"). The Office for Adult Baptism was inserted in view of the multitudes of people who had grown up unbaptized. These alterations, framed by a royal commission, were amended and adopted by Convocation, and the Book of Common Prayer, so modified, was included in an Act of Uniformity, which was to come into force on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1662. The portions of the statute which pressed hard upon the nonconforming holders of livings were those which required episcopal ordination, subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, and the use of the Prayer Book.

It has been the fashion in modern times to accuse the Church of persecution in the ejectment of the nonconforming ministers who declined to accept this settlement, and to speak of them as martyrs for conscience'

sake. We desire to speak with all respect of men who abandoned an honourable station and a certain livelihood in obedience to conscientious scruples, however mistaken. But we cannot admit that on the part of the Church there was any harshness in the measure, or in the way in which it was carried out. When the Church was restored to power, she did not revenge herself on those from whom she had suffered the persecution we have sketched in the previous chapter, by at once turning out the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, and sectarians of all kinds, who had been intruded into her parishes, colleges, and schools. She left them undisturbed in the enjoyment of her benefices, except in the few cases where the old and rightful incumbent came back to claim his own again. She had patience with them for more than two years, in the hope of winning them. As a matter of fact, the reaction which had come over the mind of the nation had affected this section of the nation also, and the great majority gladly accepted the olive branch which the Church held out to them, conformed to the doctrine and discipline and liturgy of the ancient Reformed Church of England, and retained their benefices. It would have been strange indeed if the whole body of Presbyterian, Independent, and Anabaptist preachers had been converted to Churchmanship. It was impossible for the Church to give them authority to minister at her altars and teach her people, while they refused to accept her Prayer Book, and would certainly teach what the Church of all ages had held to be false doctrine. Calamy, the historian of these Nonconformist ministers, says there were 2000 who refused to conform, and who, consequently, had to retire from the benefices they had so long usurped. He only, however, gives a list of 800

names. And we may hope that none of them, whether 800 or 2000, suffered as did the 8000 ejected clergy of the Church of England, for they were not forbidden, as these had been, to act as private chaplains and tutors, and, in fact, many of them were so provided for.

The hardships of which the ejected ministers might more justly complain began after their ejection, when they were forbidden to form congregations of Nonconformists and to act as their ministers. These prohibitions were not the work of the king or of the clergy. The Parliament consisted entirely of Royalists, who, in the rebound from their long oppression, were more royalist than the king, and more orthodox than the clergy. The king honestly tried to fulfil the hopes he had led the Nonconformists to entertain of toleration. It was Parliament which passed the Five Mile Act in 1665, and the Conventicle Act in 1670, and the Test Act in 1673. By the first, any nonconforming minister was forbidden to come within five miles of any borough town, or any place where he had recently exercised his ministry; this was intended to prevent his keeping up a rival interest in the parish in which he had served, or getting together a schismatical flock among the disaffected in the towns. The second Act forbade schismatical meetings for Divine worship; a family might meet and worship as they pleased, but if there were four strangers present besides the family, it was held to be a conventicle, and was an illegal meeting. The third Act directed that no one could hold any public office, civil or military, unless he took the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and were a member of the Established Church, which was to be evidenced by his receiving the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England at some

parish church on some Lord's day, and further signing a declaration against transubstantiation.

The king, with his easy indifference to all these ecclesiastical questions, and his shrewd good sense, recognized the policy of tolerating all peaceful citizens; a secret leaning towards Rome perhaps quickened his desire to afford, by a general toleration, some relaxation of the persecution to which the Romanists were subjected from all sides. At the end of 1662, soon after the ejection of the nonconforming ministers, he had thrown out a suggestion that if the Dissenters would demean themselves peaceably and modestly, he could heartily wish he had a power of indulgence to use upon occasion; but the House of Commons petitioned the king that no indulgence be granted to Dissenters from the Act of Uniformity. Ten years later, however, on the breaking out of the war with Holland, he took upon himself to suspend all penal laws against all kinds of nonconformists and recusants. But at the beginning of the next session Parliament again firmly remonstrated, and the king gave way and recalled the indulgence.

CHAPTER XXX

THE REVOLUTION

JAMES II. was sincerely and strongly attached to the Popish persuasion, to which he had perverted, and made no secret of his resolve to do something for it. He asserted that he never aimed at doing more than obtaining toleration and equality of civil privileges for his co-religionists, but the country very generally believed that his design was to bring his kingdoms back to the Roman obedience.

The king could not in those days do as Mary had done. Then, the Reformation was still unsettled; the distinction between the two religious parties was not so great; Parliament then was obsequious to the royal will. Circumstances were very different in James' time. The civil war had made Parliament conscious of its power, and, however loyally disposed, still it shared the popular feelings. The fires of Smithfield, the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the persecutions of the Protestants in Germany, Italy, France, and Spain, had produced in the minds of Englishmen an intense hatred and fear of Romanism. James therefore had to proceed in a different way in his design to restore his own religion to supremacy in England; to proceed gradually and in form of law; to secure toleration first, and then proceed to ascendancy. This he proposed to accomplish by means of the dispensing power.

It was an undoubted part of the ancient royal pre-

rogative that the king might suspend the action of a law in exceptional cases. But this dispensing power had quite recently been defined and limited. Charles II., as we have seen in the last chapter, had issued a Declaration of Indulgence in favour of Nonconformists, but had withdrawn it on the remonstrance of Parliament. Again, in March, 1672, he had issued a second Declaration of Indulgence, in which he suspended all the penal laws against the Romish recusants and Protestant Nonconformists, granting to the Protestant Dissenters the public exercise of their religion, to the Romanists the exercise of it in private houses. But as soon as Parliament met in the spring of 1673 it attacked the Indulgence, and the king was induced to yield. Sitting on his throne in the presence of Parliament, he sent for the Declaration, and with his own hands broke the seals and declared that it should never be drawn into a precedent.

James, however, resolved to make use of this dispensing power, and to support it by a standing army. Monmouth's rebellion had necessitated the raising of a considerable number of troops; the king had, notwithstanding the Test Act, given commissions to a considerable number of Roman Catholics. When Parliament assembled in November, 1685, the king plainly announced that he proposed to maintain the army at its full strength, on the ground that the militia had proved that they could not be trusted to protect the country from rebellion; and he declared that, having availed himself of the good service of the Roman Catholic officers, he could not consent now to dismiss them. The House of Commons, in reply to the address, remonstrated against the dispensing power; and in the House of Lords, Compton, Bishop of London, in the name of his brethren, moved that a day should be appointed for taking the address into

consideration, with a view to a similar remonstrance; whereupon the king prorogued Parliament. Seeing the temper of Parliament, the king resolved to make the law-courts the engine of his design. Though, after the recent retractation of his Indulgence by Charles II., the king might not suspend a law altogether, it was not clear whether he might not on special grounds grant exemptions to individuals by name. Before trying this question in the courts, he took care to pack the judges. Four judges who were opposed to the legality of the dispensing power, and the Attorney-General, who refused to defend it, were dismissed, and others put in their places. Then a collusive suit was brought before the King's Bench against one of the Roman Catholic officers to whom James had given a commission, and the judges declared in favour of the king.

He could thus legally officer his army—the largest standing army which any King of England had ever maintained—with officers of his own religion. Within a month he appointed four Roman Catholic Peers of the Council. But the extreme exercise of the power was reached when he gave Roman Catholics dispensations for holding ecclesiastical benefices. A clergyman who held two livings seceded to Rome, and the king gave him a dispensation to permit him to retain the emoluments of his benefices notwithstanding. The Master of University College, Oxford, seceded, together with some of the fellows and undergraduates, and turned two sets of college rooms into an oratory, in which they heard Mass daily; the king gave them a dispensation still to hold their positions in the college. So far, men who obtained emoluments in the Church while Churchmen, had been enabled to keep them when they became Romanists. In a short time the king went a step farther,

and gave Church preferment to a Roman Catholic, and it was one of the highest preferments in his gift. The deanery of Christ Church, Oxford, fell vacant. The dean was at once head of the most famous college in England, and head of the cathedral chapter of the diocese. The king appointed a Roman Catholic to this important position, and in a short time Mass was celebrated within the walls of Christ Church also. Three sees had lately become vacant — York, Oxford, and Chester. The king thought the time was hardly come for nominating Romanists to the episcopate, but he put into Oxford and Chester men of whom it was believed that when the time did come they would make little difficulty of embracing the king's faith. York was kept vacant, and it was believed that the king intended shortly to nominate Father Petre, his own Jesuit confessor, to this important position.

But besides this design of putting Roman Catholics into ecclesiastical offices, to which the king could nominate as patron, James also designed to use the royal supremacy over the Church for the purpose of subverting the reformed doctrines. The Long Parliament, indeed, among its first reforms, had abolished the High Court of Commission, and the first Parliament after the Restoration, while reviving all the other ecclesiastical courts, had declared this obnoxious court to be completely abrogated; but James determined to have it reconstituted. Meantime he assumed the power which his predecessor had exercised in times when public passions ran high, of directing the clergy to abstain from preaching on points of doctrine under controversy. This was to stop the clergy from preaching against the errors of Romanism, and the clergy generally disregarded the order. The king created an Ecclesiastical Commission, of which the

infamous Jeffries, the Chancellor, was appointed chief; and its first act was to suspend Compton, Bishop of London, for having declined to suspend Sharpe, Dean of Norwich, and Vicar of St. Giles-in-the-Fields, for having preached a controversial sermon. The clergy saw themselves, from highest to lowest, at the king's mercy. Meantime the popular discontent had been rapidly increasing. Roman Catholic chapels had sprung up all over the country. In London convents were established, and the people saw once more the frock and cowl of the friar in the streets. Riots occurred. The king formed a camp of 13,000 troops at Hounslow to overawe London. There was great discontent throughout the country; but the people shrank from anything like an approach to another civil war.

The king continued his course. He ordered the Senate of Cambridge University to admit a Benedictine monk as an M.A. They refused, were summoned before the High Commission, and the Vice-Chancellor was deprived of his mastership. He required the Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford, to elect a president contrary to their statutes. They refused to violate their oaths; were expelled, and declared incapable of holding any benefice. In a few months the intruded president died, and the king appointed a Roman Vicar Apostolic as president, and a set of Roman Catholic fellows, and the Roman service was performed in chapel, and the college turned into a Romish seminary.

The king, however, found that he could not effect all his purpose without a parliament devoted to his will, and the most violent measures were taken to pack such a parliament. Lords-Lieutenant were dismissed by the score, and men who would influence the electors put in their places. Returning officers who would take advan-

tage of any excuse for returning the court candidates were appointed. The charters of boroughs were withdrawn, and the corporations of many of the boroughs were changed, in order to secure constituencies favourable to the court.

Government employés, from the highest to the lowest were questioned, and all who would not promise to support the king's measures dismissed. The whole country was put into a state of extreme agitation. While these preparations for a general election were proceeding, the king issued (April, 1688) a second Declaration of Indulgence, and on the 4th of May he made an order in Council that the Declaration should be read on two successive Sundays at the time of Divine service by the officiating ministers of all the churches and chapels in the kingdom. In London the reading was to take place on the 20th and 27th of May, in other parts of England a fortnight later. This was a cruel affront to the whole body of the clergy; to comply was to make themselves the agents of the overthrow of the Reformation, to refuse compliance was to put themselves at the mercy of the Court of High Commission. The bishops who happened to be in London met to consider their conduct, and resolved to refuse. They presented a petition to the king, respectfully stating that Parliament had, both in the late and present reigns, declared that the sovereign was not constitutionally competent to dispense with statutes in matters ecclesiastical, that the Declaration was therefore illegal, and that they could not in prudence, honour, or conscience be parties to the solemn publication of an illegal declaration in the house of God, and during the time of Divine service. Sunday came, and in only four of the parish churches of London was the Declaration read, and in those the

congregations left the church as soon as the reading began.

The seven bishops who had signed the petition were summoned before the Council, and committed to the Tower, to be tried before the King's Bench for publishing a seditious libel. They were carried there amidst the acclamations of thousands, who had assembled all along their line of route to express their admiration of their conduct. The famous trial took place on the 29th of June, 1688. Westminster Hall and the open places round it, and the neighbouring streets for a long distance, were crowded with people. The trial lasted all day; the jury were shut up for the night; and next morning the crowds assembled again to hear the verdict. It was Not Guilty. Not one of the four judges had ventured to assert the legality of the dispensing power; the verdict dealt a fatal blow to it. The news was conveyed over London by the rejoicing shouts of the people. The troops at Hounslow joined in the general acclamation. Mounted messengers were sent off to all the great towns of the kingdom, and there were great rejoicings at the victory of the Church and nation against the arbitrary power of the king.

On that very day was despatched an invitation, signed by seven influential men, representatives of various parties in the State, including one of the bishops, inviting the Prince of Orange to come over and deliver the liberties of Englishmen and the Protestant religion from the tyranny of the king.

James was not deterred from pursuing his course by the strong proofs of its unpopularity. Within a fortnight after the trial of the seven bishops, the officials of the dioceses were ordered to report to the High Commission the names of the clergy who had omitted

to read the Declaration. The High Commission met to receive the returns. Scarcely an official had obeyed the order. Instead, Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, sent in his resignation of his seat on the Commission. The Commission began to be alarmed, and contented itself with an order that the returns be sent in within four months. Other symptoms of opposition appeared. The Chancellor of the University of Oxford died, the graduates assembled at once, and elected a successor. They were just in time. Two hours later came the king's mandate to them to choose the infamous Jeffries. A few weeks later, one of the four London clergy who had read the Declaration was rewarded with the see of Oxford. The canons refused to attend his installation; the university refused to give him the usual complimentary degree of D.D.; not a single candidate came to him for holy orders. Soon after, a living in the gift of Magdalen College fell vacant; the dispossessed president and fellows met and made an appointment, and the Bishop of Gloucester instituted their presentee without hesitation.

In October, when it was known that William of Orange was about to enter England, the king made concessions. The Court of High Commission was abolished; the Bishop of London's suspension was cancelled; steps were taken to reinstate the Fellows of Magdalen. But it was all too late. On the 5th of November William landed in Torbay. The nobles and leading men in the kingdom flocked to his camp; the troops deserted to him by whole regiments; and the Princess Anne abandoned her father's cause. On the 23rd of December James fled from the kingdom. On the 6th of February the Convention declared that James's flight was an abdication, that the throne was vacant,

and that William and Mary should be king and queen of England.

The Bill of Rights provided that in future the sovereign should not be a Papist, and as a test required that at the coronation he should repeat and subscribe the Declaration against Transubstantiation; and also that no person who should marry a Papist should be capable of reigning.

CHAPTER XXXI

RELIGIOUS TOLERATION

It is a very common idea that the Church in those days was specially intolerant, and that the opponents of the Church were the champions of religious liberty. The truth is, that at that time the principle of religious toleration had not entered into the minds of men; whatever religious principles a man held to be the truth, these he believed it to be his duty to maintain, and to propagate by every means in his power. The reasoning was clear, and seemed to them unanswerable. A right faith is necessary to salvation. To permit a man to propagate false doctrine was to permit him to do his best to slay souls. It was the duty of those to whom the guardianship of the faith was committed—the authorities of Church and State—to restrain these spiritual criminals. To tolerate them was to give evidence of the most culpable religious indifference. It was held with equal universality, as a maxim of good government, that differences on religious questions ought to be restrained by the civil power. Religious differences more than anything else divide the people into parties; enter into all other questions, political and social; create disaffection to the Government; and distract and weaken the body politic. The experience of all Europe for a century seemed to have given such terrible proofs of this that he would have been thought mad who doubted. All parties acted on these principles when in power. When

Elizabeth came to the throne every endeavour was made to win the Romish party to accept the Reformation. When the Pope at length excommunicated the queen, and they seceded, they became at once the objects of persecution. They were liable to fine and imprisonment for not conforming to the worship of the Church of England. Priests, who were looked upon as the organizers and ringleaders of disaffection and disloyalty, were banished under pain of death. Those for whom the moderate and conservative English Reformation had not gone far enough were just as little permitted to form separate congregations; nor indeed did their action lie in this direction; the majority of them did not seek leave to secede from the Church and worship God according to their own consciences, but they aimed at spreading their own opinions and procuring their own practices to be permitted within the Church.

When at length the Puritan principles did prevail in the Church the old doctrines of the Reformation were in turn disallowed. When Abbot was Archbishop of Canterbury, and wielded the power of the High Commission Court, he was bitterly severe to all except the Puritans; to question the Calvinistic doctrine of absolute decrees was looked upon as deadly heresy. Arminianism and Popery were classed together, and were alike the objects of popular hatred and authoritative persecution.

When the Anglo-Catholic school came into power with Charles and Laud, it in turn used the means which existed to its hand, and which had lately been used against itself, for the purpose of compelling conformity. Laud hated Puritanism as bitterly as Abbot had hated Arminianism; he saw that a great reaction had set in towards the true principles of the English Reformation; he saw that Puritanism was leagued with the new

political spirit and threatened the constitution in Church and State. The authorities in Church and State—the King, Strafford, Laud—had come to the conclusion that conciliation was useless, and compromise impossible; that they must resolutely oppose and conquer the assailants of Church and monarchy, or Church and monarchy would be conquered and overthrown. The result proved that the fears of king and archbishop were not chimerical; the opposition triumphed; the king and both his ministers lost their heads; the monarchy and the Church were overthrown and proscribed.

Other religionists showed no more comprehension of the duty of toleration than Churchmen did. The Scottish Puritans made it a condition of their alliance with the English rebels against King Charles that England should adopt the Solemn League and Covenant; and subscription to that engagement was forthwith enforced upon all Englishmen. The League and Covenant pledged all its subscribers to extirpate Popery and Prelacy, and Prelacy meant the episcopal form of Church government, so that the League was an act of intolerance aimed especially at the Church of England.

And when the Presbyterians obtained power through the success of the Parliamentary rebellion they showed no reluctance to fulfil their engagement. They abolished the order of bishops, and ejected all the clergy who refused the Covenant, and made it penal to use the Prayer Book in public, or even to use it in private devotions,[1] or to speak against the Directory. They tolerated Independents and Baptists as little as they

[1] As Macaulay puts it, "It was a crime for a child to read by the bedside of a sick parent one of those beautiful collects which had soothed the griefs of forty generations of Christians."

did Papists and Prelatists, and the inoffensive Quakers had a hard time under their rule. The Puritan divines expressly disclaimed the principle of toleration, and declared it to be a wicked dereliction of duty. Baxter, one of their greatest writers, says: "My judgment I have always made known; I abhor unlimited toleration, or any toleration at all." He also wrote a little treatise called 'The Fair Warning; or, Twenty-five Reasons against Toleration and Indulgence of Popery.' Edwards, another of the chief Puritan writers, says: "Toleration! why, it is the grand design of the devil. It is the master-piece and the chief engine by which he keeps up his tottering kingdom. Other evils are against some one or two places of Holy Scripture, but this is against them all. This is the Abaddon, the Apollyon, the abomination of desolation, the destroyer of all religion, the liberty of perdition." That these opinions were not those of one or two men, but were generally held by their party, is confirmed by a declaration put forth at that period by eighty-four Nonconformist ministers, in which they say: "Toleration! it is like putting a sword into the hand of a madman, a cup of poison into the hands of children; a letting loose of madmen with firebrands in their hands; an appointing of a city of refuge in men's consciences for the devil to fly to; laying of a stumbling-block before the blind; proclaiming liberty to wolves to come into Christ's fold to prey upon the lambs; a toleration of soul-murder (the greatest of all murder), and for the establishing whereof damned souls in hell would accuse men on earth."

Cromwell made a nearer approach to toleration, inasmuch as he tolerated Presbyterians and Baptists, as well as his own sect. But Churchmen were as rigorously treated as ever under the Commonwealth; and the last

act of persecution of the clergy of the Church of England, which drove them out of the schools and tutorships in which some of them had sought a livelihood, was due to Cromwell. The best evidence, however, of the view which the Independents took of the principles of toleration is to be found in their declarations and their deeds when they had established a commonwealth of their own in New England, and were able to act without check.

In May, 1631, at the first court of election at Massachusetts, it was ordered that no person should be admitted to the rights of a citizen who was not previously admitted as a member of one of the (Independent) churches. In 1635 the celebrated Sir Harry Vane came out and was elected governor; but even his influence was not sufficient to prevent Mrs. Hutchinson and an ultra-Calvinist party from being banished from the state. Towards the end of the same year Mr. Roger Williams, a Baptist minister, and afterwards founder of the state of Rhode Island, having broached and divulged divers new and dangerous opinions, was expelled from the colony. In 1650 a code of laws was drawn up for Connecticut. It began thus: "Whosoever shall worship any other God but the Lord shall be put to death." Blasphemy, adultery, sorcery, theft, disobedience to parents, were punished with death. Non-attendance on Divine service was punished by fine. In July, 1651, a Mr. Obadiah Holmes, a Baptist, was "well whipt" for being a Baptist. In 1656 attention was turned to the Quakers. It was the Congregationalist ministers by whom the magistrates were moved against them, and by a law of the state of Massachusetts, passed October 14th in that year, it was enacted that any Quaker landing on the coast should be seized and whipped, then imprisoned with hard labour, and finally

expelled from the colony. On one occasion three Quaker women were stripped to the waist, amid frost and snow, and flogged through eleven towns. By a subsequent law every male Quaker, besides former penalties, was to lose one ear on the first conviction, and on a second the other; and both males and females on the third conviction were to have their tongues bored through with a red-hot iron. Plymouth, Connecticut, and New Haven, on the recommendation of the Commissioners for the United Colonies, adopted similar laws.[1] In spite of whippings, brandings, and cropping of ears, the banished Quakers persisted in returning. In hope of stopping them, a law for the capital punishment of returned Quakers was at length enacted in Massachusetts; and Marmaduke Stephenson of Yorkshire, William Robinson of London, and Mary Dyer of Newport were condemned under it. The two men were actually executed; the woman, after witnessing the execution of her companions, was reprieved on the scaffold, on condition of leaving the colony in forty-eight hours. Impelled by "the spirit," however, she presently returned to "the bloody town of Boston," and was taken and hanged. Four Quakers were hanged together, a drummer preventing any of their dying words from being heard. Captains of vessels were flogged for bringing Quakers into port. Every Roman Catholic priest who returned after one expulsion was put to death.[2]

[1] Mr. Holdreth's History.

[2] A modern Nonconformist historian (Vaughan, 'English Nonconformists,' pp. 141, 146) defends this conduct on precisely the same grounds on which the statesmen and ecclesiastics of Henry, or Elizabeth, or Charles, would have defended similar action: "It was natural that such onslaughts as were made upon its order by the Quakers should be met with a determined resistance . . . Mrs. Hutchinson's antinomian virulence and activity were such as no Church, having any pretension to discipline, would tolerate . . . It belongs to the magistrate to coerce such people, and to make the coercion strong."

Even the fires of Smithfield were rekindled by Puritan hands in the New World. Indians who had submitted to baptism, and afterwards returned to their old belief, were burnt as relapsed heretics.

It has been the fashion in modern times to look upon William III. as the first sovereign who advocated principles of religious toleration, but this is unjust to the memory of former kings. In the reign of James I. Puritanism was encouraged, and the king endeavoured to obtain toleration for the Romanists. Charles I. endeavoured to obtain toleration for the Romanists. Charles II. used his royal prerogative in two declarations of indulgence, giving toleration to both Nonconformists and Romanists, allowing the former to meet in public worship and the latter to exercise their worship in private houses. Parliament demanded the recall of these indulgences, and prevented the permanent establishment then of religious toleration. James II. desired to give toleration to all in order to secure it for his own co-religionists. William, himself inclined to Puritanism and Presbyterianism, succeeded in obtaining toleration for the Dissenters, but left the Roman Catholics under all their disabilities.

The truth is, that toleration is a political rather than a religious question, and therefore it is that kings and statesmen advocated toleration long before the religionists of any denomination were willing to adopt it. They who had in their foreign relations to treat with Roman Catholic kings and Protestant states learnt that it was possible to find a basis for conducting the affairs of life with both one and the other. They who had to ask toleration for Protestants abroad of their Roman Catholic sovereigns, saw the inconsistency and inconvenience of persecuting Roman Catholics in England. When they had failed to exterminate dissent among their own

subjects, as a cause of civil disturbance and weakness, they sought next to secure toleration for Dissenters, in order to minimize the civil evils of dissent, and finally felt bound to protect them in their civil rights as loyal and peaceable subjects.

William's first step was to secure the passing of a Toleration Act, which for the first time gave leave to Dissenters from the National Church openly to hold separated religious assemblies. Next, he endeavoured to include the Nonconformists within the Church, by inducing the Church to lay aside some of its peculiarities, and the Nonconformists to re-enter it.

The Comprehension Bill, introduced with this object, proposed to abolish subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, to admit men with Presbyterian ordination by some episcopal form which should satisfy both parties, to make the use of the surplice and the cross in baptism and the posture at reception of the Holy Communion optional. Many Churchmen objected to it on the ground that while it might satisfy some Nonconformists, and enable them to enter into the Church, it would dissatisfy many Churchmen, and drive them out. Some of the more extreme Nonconformists were opposed to a comprehension, because, by admitting many of the most influential of their brethren into the Church, it would leave themselves in a small minority; while many of the more moderate and respectable of the Nonconformist divines are said to have been satisfied with the Toleration Act, which gave them full freedom, and were not very anxious to exchange their lucrative and influential positions, as ministers of wealthy middle-class congregations in London and the great towns, for the chance of promotion to the vicarages and rectories on which the clergy of the Church were notoriously half-starved.

William was also desirous of a repeal of the Test Act in order to open for Dissenters the way to public offices and employments, and endeavoured to effect his object by making it understood that if the legislature would consent to repeal the Test Act, he would be willing to allow the clergy to retain their benefices without taking the oath of allegiance to him. But the feeling of Churchmen generally was strongly in favour of the Test Act as necessary to the security of the National Church. The result was that the Nonconformists remained excluded from office in the State, and the Non-Jurors were turned out of their benefices in the Church.

In the early part of the nineteenth century, however, partly through the willingness of Churchmen to make concessions for the sake of peace, partly through the desire of politicians to obtain the support of a powerful and able party, the Dissenters were relieved from all political disabilities. The Test Act was repealed in 1829; the Roman Catholics were "emancipated" in 1830; the Jewish disabilities were removed in 1858; and all civil offices were thus thrown open to all. Then the Dissenting movement assumed the form of an assault upon the privileges of the Church, and the same causes led to continued concessions. In 1838 an Education Act gave State subsidies to Elementary Schools of all denominations; in 1870 another Act established a system of Board Schools from which denominational teaching was excluded. In 1869 Dissenters were admitted to equal rights in the Church Grammar Schools; and Acts of 1870 and 1892 deprived the Church of its exclusive right to its own colleges in the Universities, and threw their emoluments and government open to all comers. In 1868 the compulsory payment of Church Rates was abolished, and in 1880 a Burials Act admitted

Dissenting ministers to perform service in the churchyards.

The Irish Church was disestablished in 1869; and in 1920 the long-threatened disestablishment and disendowment of the Church in Wales became an established fact. Both Churches, however, surmounted their difficulties bravely and their spiritual life was not impaired.

CHAPTER XXXII

THE MODERN PERIOD

In the latter part of the 18th century the Church of England had sunk into a condition of inactivity. There were still no doubt many sincerely good people, but the general tone was dry and formal, without zeal or unction. Macaulay's summary of it is—"It was an age of spiritual indifference and lethargy. . . . The clergy were generally charitable, kindly, moral, and well educated—according to the standard of the age—in all but theology. . . . The Nonconformist ministers, comfortably established among their flocks and enjoying their modest temporalities, shared the spiritual ease of Churchmen." Over this general deadness there suddenly came a breath of new life, which is known as the Evangelical Revival. In the Church it led to the formation of the Evangelical party, and of the Wesleyan Societies, the Connexions of Whitfield and of Lady Huntingdon, which, beginning within the Church, sooner or later passed over its pale.

The enthusiasm of the new movement naturally alarmed and irritated the ignorant conservatism of the mass of the people, and its leaders were opposed, reviled, and ridiculed; but the movement spread, and in time leavened the mass, and produced a sincere and earnest revival of personal religion.

The special features of the School were the inculcation of a very earnest faith in the Atonement, and a profound veneration for the very letter of Holy Scripture. Warm

and sometimes exciting preaching took the place of dry theology and morality; and the wide and tolerant charity of the adherents of the School led to a free religious intercourse with Protestant Dissenters, which had the effect of tinging the teaching of the Evangelical School with Calvinism; not, however, of the harsh school of Scotland and Holland, but rather a gentle form of that Augustinianism which, while it adores the Divine foreknowledge, forgets human free-will.

The dangers or defects of the School lay in its tendency to narrowness of mind; to the obscuration of other parts of the Christian scheme by the special prominence given to one (the Atonement); to the undue exaltation of preaching above other Church ordinances, and the consequent undervaluing of Creeds, Sacraments, Worship, and indeed of the whole idea and system of the Church. These latter tendencies caused the Evangelicals to be nicknamed "Low" Churchmen.

The beginning of the decline of the Evangelical School as a party marks the revival of the "High" Church School. In the earlier half of the 19th century there were still a few isolated clergymen who had inherited the learning and the principles of the old High Church School; but the revival of this party, as one of the modern schools of thought in the Church, began in Oxford about the year 1825. Newman, Pusey, Keble, Froude, Isaac Williams, Palmer, R. Wilberforce were among the principal leaders, and the common room of Oriel College the chief scene of their consultations. The movement arose out of a natural reaction against the defects of the Evangelical system, and was a revival of the views of the early 16th century Reformers, and the Reformers of the Jacobean period of our history; but its leaders did not go back to either one period or the other for their opinions;

they derived their theology from an original and profound study of the Holy Scriptures, and of the Fathers, Doctors, and Historians of the Early Ages of the Church; and incidentally created a school of theologians and Church historians of which the Church of this century has reason to be proud.

The doctrinal revival was popularized by the famous 'Tracts for the Times,' and by Keble's 'Christian Year.' It soon led to improvement in outward worship; more frequent celebrations of Holy Communion, improved psalmody. Meanwhile, a co-ordinate movement originated in the sister University in the favour of the study of Ecclesiology, *i. e.* of Church architecture, art, and antiquities generally, which proved a valuable aid to the revival. The repair and ornamentation of dilapidated and neglected churches took place in every direction.

The teaching and practices of the new school excited great and general alarm. It was thought that they were calculated to lead the people back to Rome. As the "Evangelicals" in their early days had been the victims of persecution from those whom they painfully awaked from their slumbers, so now the "Tractarians" had to suffer in their turn. The clergy of that school were reviled as traitors, and treated with personal insult and violence. Riots were systematically organized in their churches, and the services interrupted. But the more thoughtful began to listen and reason, and to understand that the new school really adopted the chief truths of the personal relation of the soul to God, which it had been the glory of the Evangelical teaching to revive, and supplemented that system of thought in some of the points in which it had been defective; and that to this more complete system of religious teaching it added all that apparatus of Creeds and Sacraments, of order and

organization which Christ had founded in His Church, to consolidate and preserve and propagate the faith.

One very marked result of the acceptance of this supplementary teaching has been the change which it has wrought in the views and practices of the great body of the clergy and people, even of those who clung to old party denominations. It is probable that between the great body of those who would be classed as belonging to the moderate High Church School, and those who would still claim to belong to the Evangelical School, there is not much difference in doctrines or in the usages of divine worship; and there is between them a mutual understanding and sympathy which increases day by day, and is full of promise for the future of the Church of England.

The dangers of the High Church School are, in the main, the correlatives of those of the Evangelical. There is a tendency to exaggerate the value of externals, and to press upon reluctant people an amount of ritual which, though helpful to those who understand it, is unedifying to those who do not, and are consequently prejudiced against it; to add to, or to alter, without adequate authority that which is prescribed in the written rules of the Church; to confuse the teaching of a school of thought with that of the whole Church, and so to give to opinions the force of Articles of the Creed. And the reaction from the ultra-Protestant notion that everything belonging to the Church of Rome is detestable and abominable, and the consequent discovery that part of the Roman teaching and practice is Catholic and good, has led to the error of mistaking some things purely Roman, or rather Papal, for Catholic and primitive.[1]

[1] Adapted, with permission, from the *Dictionary of the Church of England.*

The rapid increase of Dissent began about the beginning of the nineteenth century. Its chief causes were the rapid increase of the population, and its accumulation in the manufacturing and mining centres; and the hindrances to the prompt and vigorous action of the Church in the facts that the Convocations of the Church had not been allowed to meet for business for a century; that a parish could not be subdivided and new parishes created without the costly process of a special Act of Parliament; that the Church had had no experience for 300 years in the creation of new ecclesiastical organizations; that, on the other hand, it was comparatively easy to organize Dissent; and perhaps, it must be added, that the spirit of the new manufacturing class was energetic, self-reliant, ignorant of theology or of Church history or principles, and impatient of the slowness of the Church to sympathize with its feelings and to provide for its wants.

The Church, however, soon roused itself to deal with the task before it, and one of the most remarkable features of the religious revival of this century is the way in which the machinery of the Church has been repaired, re-adjusted, and extended, to meet the religious needs of the people.

As early as 1836 the Tithe Commutation Act settled the revenues of the parochial benefices at some sacrifice of income, but with the avoidance of a cause of friction in the collection. At the same time a Permanent Ecclesiastical Commission was appointed to take in hand the estates of the bishops and deans and chapters, to modernize the management, and to make the best of the properties; to give fixed incomes to the bishops and other dignitaries, greatly reducing the number of canons, and to apply the surplus to the endowment of benefices.

A series of Church Building Acts from 1825 onward facilitated the subdivision of the great towns and the creation of new parishes, for which the surplus funds in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commission happily supplied modest endowments. About 4000 new parishes were created between the years 1825 and 1900, fully equipped with parsonages, schools, and all usual parochial machinery. At the same time, every cathedral and nearly every parish church has been not merely substantially repaired, but restored, in the majority of cases with adequate knowledge and good taste, to something of its original architectural beauty. For this work parliamentary returns have revealed the fact that from 1840 to 1894 more than fifty millions of pounds were voluntarily contributed by Church people.

In the building work of the nineteenth century, besides the restoration of the ancient churches and the building of over 4000 new ones, and the providing of parsonage houses on every benefice, must be noticed the introduction of several new features: hamlet chapels for bringing the means of grace within easy reach of groups of population at a distance from the parish church; mission chapels, with services specially adapted to the wants of the poorer inhabitants of the crowded towns; parish-rooms and club-rooms to meet the social wants of the people both in town and country parishes; probably about 5000 such supplementary buildings have been added to the Church's material plant, chiefly of late years, and their number is rapidly increasing.

By the abolition of pluralities and of non-residence, made possible by the building of parsonage houses wherever they were lacking, by the addition of new incumbents, and by the employment of assistant curates in large and populous parishes, the number of the

clergy was probably more than doubled during the century.

An equally remarkable addition to the staff of the Church has taken place in its highest ranks. Many new bishoprics (Ripon, Manchester, St. Albans, Truro, Liverpool, Newcastle, Southwell, Wakefield, Bristol, Birmingham, Chelmsford, Coventry, St. Edmundsbury and Ipswich, Southwark, Bradford, Sheffield) have been created and endowed by voluntary contributions. The mediæval experiment of suffragan bishops has been revived for supplying the bishops of the larger dioceses with assistance.

A very important addition to the working power of the Church has been obtained by the organization of women's work in the shape of Sisterhoods of Mercy. The movement met at first with great suspicion and opposition. It was perhaps the work of Miss Nightingale's nurses in the Crimean War and of the London Sisterhoods during the cholera of 1866 which disarmed prejudice, and led people generally to recognize the value of highly-educated, carefully-trained, and self-sacrificing women in many departments of work. They have revolutionized the whole idea and practice of sick-nursing throughout the country; they have proved that there is no evangelizing agency so powerful among the lowest classes of the town populations as their gentle, self-devoted ministries. The new agency was definitely recognized, and regulations laid down for its guidance by the bishops of the Convocation of Canterbury in 1890.

The Church has always laboured to promote the education of the people; the education of Englishmen from the conversion of their forefathers to the Christian faith until recently has been almost exclusively the work of the Church. In modern times the Society

for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in the reign of William and Mary (1698), founded the Parochial Charity Schools which still exist. In 1841 the S.P.C.K. organized a branch society—the National Society—to take up its educational work. By the time that the state set up its Board School system in 1870, the Church had already expended over fifteen millions of pounds in providing a National School in nearly every parish in the kingdom, with accommodation for 1,365,080 scholars, with training colleges for the supply of competent teachers.

When the School Board system was founded, with its unsatisfactory provision of "undenominational" religious teaching, the Church made great exertions to increase its own schools, with such success that by 1892 it had exactly doubled the number of its school places, at an additional expenditure of over twenty-one millions; making the total voluntary expenditure of the Church on elementary education, from 1840 to 1892, amount to over thirty-six millions.

To these authentic statistics of the expenditure of the Church on Church Building and Education may be added the following:—

The *Official Year Book of the Church of England* gives a summary of the voluntary contributions of the Church during a recent year (1922), under the following heads:—

VOLUNTARY OFFERINGS, 1922.

General Purposes	£
Home Work	1,685,465
Foreign Work	1,250,000
Educational Work	57,975
The Clergy (Educational and Charitable Assistance)	150,648
Philanthropic Work	564,409
Total	3,708,497

Parochial Purposes	£
Parochial Clergy	1,084,196
Elementary Education	432,287
General Parochial Purposes	3,554,763
General Charitable Objects	273,312
Total	5,344,558

For General Purposes	3,708,497
For Parochial Purposes	5,344,558
	9,053,055

CHAPTER XXXIII

DISSENT

THE Registrar-General's return of places licensed for divine worship in the year 1894 enumerates 273 different denominations in England and Wales. It is not our purpose even to transcribe their names; but it is necessary, in a view of the turning points of the history of the Church of England, to point out the origin of the chief schisms which have thus gradually subdivided themselves, and which form so conspicuous a feature in the religious condition of the country at the present day.

We have seen that in all the revolutions through which the Church passed, from the time of Henry VIII. to that of Elizabeth, it was the Church as a whole which swayed, now to this side, now to that. The Church included within it men of very different opinions. Some of these opinions amounted to the most grievous heresies; and truth was sometimes accounted heresy, and men and women and children suffered at different periods for opposite opinions; but so far there had been no schism, no body of men had joined together and cut themselves off from the Church, and set up altar against altar.

The first body of men who took this step were the Independents, whose schism took place in the reign of Elizabeth, about the year 1568. The cause of their secession was rather the question of Church government than of doctrine. At bottom it was the assertion of the principle that the people were the legitimate source

of authority in religious matters: in opposition to the principle held by the Church of Christ in all previous ages all over Christendom, that the divinely established episcopate was the source of authority.

The theory of the Church was and is, that our Lord Jesus Christ founded a society, which in Scripture is called the Church; that on the day of Pentecost the Holy Ghost came into this Church, according to Christ's promise; that thereafter there were added to the Church daily by the rite of baptism such as were made disciples, and were brought into the way of salvation; that Christ appointed twelve Apostles through whom He would rule the Church, and who should minister His Word and the sacraments of His grace.

It was held by the whole body of Christian people through fifteen centuries that all who desired to be saved ought to enter into this visible society by baptism, and ought to continue in the unity and obedience of this one universal Church. It was held that the Apostles, acting under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, had ordained three orders of ministers—bishops, priests, and deacons—in whom were continued the authority and the powers which Christ had given to themselves.[1] It was always and everywhere held that the government of the Church, and the continuance of the ministry of the Church by ordination, were committed to the chief of these three orders, the episcopate.

The PRESBYTERIANS held the theory of the Divine authority of the ministry. In the time of the Long Parliament, the Assembly of Divines recognized it by a formal vote, and nearly induced the Parliament to pass a vote to the same effect. But the Presbyterians held

[1] Excepting the miraculous powers, which died out when the occasion of them had passed.

that the authority resided in the presbyters, and only acknowledged bishops as being of the same order as presbyters, though appointed, for the sake of discipline, to the exclusive performance of certain functions, and to preside over the rest.

The INDEPENDENTS started the diametrically opposite principle that any number of Christian men might form themselves into a Church, and that such Church had the power to govern itself, to elect its own ministers, there being no difference of order between the ministry and the laity, and to regulate all questions of discipline or of doctrine without interference from without. The first rule of the present Congregational Union of England and Wales lays down "as the distinctive principle of Congregational Churches, the scriptural right of every separate Church [*i. e.* congregation] to maintain perfect independence in the government and administration of its own affairs." Or, as another exponent of its principles says: "The distinctive principle of Congregationalism is that a Church [*i. e.* a congregation] is complete in itself, and that all questions of faith, discipline, and membership are to be settled by its members." The same principle when carried into civil politics was republicanism, and naturally put those who held it into an attitude of antagonism to the authorities of a monarchical state; and we find the sect all through its history acting as a political as well as a religious party.

Brown, a clergyman of the Church of England, was the founder of the sect, and he established the first separated congregation in London about 1568. In 1571 he began to attract public attention. He was summoned before the Ecclesiastical Commission, and bidden to hold his peace, whereupon he left the kingdom and

took refuge in Holland.[1] His followers continued to meet and to agitate. This was a time of great trouble and anxiety in England. The public mind was full of fear of conspiracies of the Romanizing party, and of plots against the queen's life. The Spanish Armada was gathering its overwhelming forces together for the conquest of the kingdom and the subversion of its religion and liberties. The Independents added to the anxieties and difficulties of the queen and her ministry by promulgating these new doctrines, which undermined all authority in the State as well as the Church, and by associating themselves in illegal societies, and gathering numbers together in illegal meetings. "In the ten years between 1583 and 1593 five Independents were hanged, not by the Church, not for doctrinal errors, but for what the judges determined to be seditious and inflammatory language, dangerous to the peace of the kingdom. The advisers of the queen after a time became aware that these severe punishments tended to incite commiseration with the criminals, and in the latter part of her reign these dangerous persons were merely banished out of the kingdom." They took refuge in Holland, establishing congregations at Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and especially at Leyden, and published the first Independent 'Confession of Faith' at Amsterdam in 1596.

It is curious to see how soon their principles ran to their absurdest extremes. It would sound to many people like an unfair comment on their principles to say that, if carried to their extreme, they would lead to indefinite self-will and subdivision, until at length every man became a Church by himself. But this is the

[1] Eventually he returned to England, abandoned his errors, was reconciled to the Church, and died as one of her ministers.

extreme at which, in a very short time, they practically arrived. Johnson, one of their leaders in Holland, excommunicated his own father-in-law. Ainsworth, another minister, excommunicated Johnson. Johnson in return excommunicated Ainsworth. At length, one of them, not finding any one with whom he could agree, baptized himself, and formed a Church in himself with a distinct name, for they gave him the name of the Se-Baptist. In another respect, too, their principles were speedily carried to an equally absurd extreme. From objecting to forms of prayer, they quite logically went on to object to forms of praise also, and resolved that "every man may in the congregation conceive his own matter in the act of praising, deliver it in prose or metre, as he lists himself, and in the same instant chant out in what tune soever that which comes first into his own head."[1]

We have seen in previous chapters the subsequent history of the Independents. In 1620 the "Pilgrim Fathers" sailed for the New World, and established in New England that form of civil and religious polity which we have had occasion to glance at.[2] They who remained behind joined in the rebellion in 1643 against Charles I., gradually obtained power in the army, overmastered the Presbyterian Parliamentarians, murdered the king, expelled the Parliament, and enabled Oliver Cromwell to seize the reins of power, and hold them for ten years. In 1654 the Committee of "Tryers," consisting of Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, was appointed to examine and appoint men to hold the benefices of the Church of England. In 1658 an Independent "Establishment" was attempted, but failed, as

[1] Perry's 'History of Church of England,' I., p. 314.
[2] Page 298, &c.

the Presbyterian Establishment had previously done. In 1662 the intruders into the benefices were required either to accept the doctrines of the Church of England and be regularly ordained, or to yield their usurped places. During the ten years of the preponderance of the Independents in Church and State, they had time to show to future generations of Englishmen how they would carry out their principles amidst the limiting conditions of an old country like England, as well as on the free stage of a new world.

In the reigns of Charles II. and James II. they were not allowed to hold assemblies for public worship. The "Toleration Act" of William III. gave them this liberty. The repeal of the "Test Act" in 1828 opened to them all civil offices.

The ROMAN CATHOLICS. It is common to separate the Roman Catholics from the other sects, but, from our present point of view at least, we must include them among the sects which separated from the Church of Christ in this country in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. We have already in our history of the period had occasion to state the circumstances under which the schism originated, and need here only note a few of the principal dates of their subsequent history as a sect.

In the early part of Elizabeth's reign the party which leaned towards Rome conformed to the Church of England; and since the Pope offered to authorize the existing state of things in the English Church, if only the Church would recognize his supremacy, it is clear that there was nothing in the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, beyond the question of the supremacy, which necessitated, and therefore which justified, the secession.

It was not until the year 1570, the twelfth year of

Elizabeth's reign, that the Pope lost all hope of recovering England to his obedience, and thereupon excommunicated the queen, absolved her subjects from their allegiance, and authorized the King of Spain to invade the country and execute his sentence of deposition, and restore the Papal supremacy over the Church.

It was this political view of the subject which gave its bitterness to the quarrel. Those who recognized the Papal authority were looked upon as disaffected and dangerous subjects. Popish priests were looked upon as emissaries of a foreign potentate engaged in organizing treasonable enterprises. There is no doubt that such treasonable enterprises were for many years continually in agitation. Therefore the Popish recusants were persecuted, and Popish priests who defied the law which forbade them the kingdom were executed when caught. The Spanish Armada and Babbington's Conspiracy in Elizabeth's reign, and the Gunpowder Plot in James's, Charles II.'s Roman Catholic queen and her Popish chaplains, and James II.'s attack on the Church, kept alive the popular fear and hatred of Romanism, which the fires of Smithfield had first burnt into the hearts of the people—a fear and hatred which to this day are so strong that it is easy to excite an outburst of popular fury against anything of which the popular ignorance can be led to believe that it tends ever so remotely in the direction of Rome.

This feeling prevented the Roman schism from being included in the earlier acts of toleration. The Act of William excluded the Papists, and the repeal of the Test Act still left them under their disabilities. But in 1829 the "Catholic Emancipation Act" gave the members of this sect the same liberty which had been conceded to the other sects.

The internal history of the schism is indicated by a few dates of the principal steps in it. In 1598 the Pope first commissioned an arch-priest to govern the English Papists. In 1623, by an intrigue of the Jesuits, who thus escaped from local supervision, a titular bishop of Chalcedon was appointed, instead of the arch-priest, as Vicar Apostolic. He had only one episcopal successor. Under James II. the kingdom was divided into four districts, each under an arch-priest; and this arrangement continued to the middle of the present century. In 1850 what is called the "Papal Aggression" took place, when the Pope parcelled out England into bishoprics, and appointed a number of bishops with local titles. These bishops, however, are not allowed to exercise the canonical rights of diocesan bishops, and are nothing more than Papal officials. English Romanism, isolated from Rome and still influenced by English character and contact with the Church of England, long retained much of the freedom of English mediæval religion, and much of the mediæval English feeling of resistance to the extreme claims of the Roman see; but it is to be feared that it is now much more ultramontane than at any previous period. The acceptance of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception in 1854, and of the decree of the Papal Infallibility in 1870, has immeasurably widened the gulf between us.

The Papal sect in England does not in any respect represent the old unreformed Church of England. (*a*) Its bishops and clergy do not derive their succession from the old lines of English bishops, but are intruders appointed by the Bishop of Rome; and these bishops do not possess the authority of the old English bishops, but are arbitrarily limited in their functions by the power which creates them.

(*b*) This body is not governed by the old Canon Law of the English Church, but by that of the Roman Church.

(*c*) It does not use the old English Liturgy, but the modern Roman Service Books.

(*d*) The doctrine which the Papal sect teaches is not the doctrine of the ancient unreformed Church of England, but that doctrine plus the Creed of Pope Pius, and the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, and the Papal Infallibility, and other modern accretions.

(*e*) The *raison d'être* of the Papal sect in England is the assertion of the Papal supremacy; but the supremacy which it asserts is the modern theory that the Pope is by Divine right the absolute ruler of the Church, and the infallible teacher of Divine truth; which is a totally different thing from the patriarchal authority, carefully defined and limited, which the Church of England admitted at the Conquest, and, finding it burdensome and mischievous, threw off at the Reformation.

The *Church and nation* of the time of our Edwards and Henries would have had as little sympathy as we ourselves have with the arrogant endeavour to subvert the Church of England, and plant the Papal tyranny upon its ruins.

The ANABAPTISTS. Still taking the various schisms in the order of time, we come next to that of the Baptists, as they call themselves, or, as they ought rather to be called, the Anabaptists (because they baptize over again), or the Antipædobaptists (because they deny the validity of infant baptism). The sect of this name is first heard of in Holland, where it mixed up its religious belief with political designs, and ran into excesses subversive of all religion and all society. Their seizure of the city of Munster, and their conspiracy for seizing

other cities, made them special objects of repression by the governments of the period; and this will account for the severity of their treatment. Fourteen Anabaptist refugees from Holland were put to death in the reign of Henry VIII.; others in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth; and the very last person who suffered death in England on religious grounds was an Anabaptist named Whiteman, in the reign of James I.

The modern sect of Baptists, however, may fairly disclaim connexion or sympathy with these fanatics. It began in 1633, and arose out of a secession from the Independents. A few members of this sect, who held a stricter form of Calvinistic doctrine, and desired to maintain a stricter discipline among Church members, formed themselves into a separate body. They retained the Independent polity, and adopted the distinctive practice of admitting into their society, by baptizing them, only adult members, who gave what were considered to be satisfactory proofs of earnest piety. Their reasons for re-baptizing were not only that they disapproved of the baptism of infants, but also that they denied the validity of baptism by affusion or aspersion. It is not our business here to combat all the errors which we chronicle, so that we shall abstain from reciting the abundant evidence in favour of baptizing infants, or the argument in favour of the sufficiency of baptism by aspersion.

The distinctive idea which lay at the root of the Baptist sect was the desire to have a select Church, which should consist only of truly holy men. We know that this is a dream. Our Lord warned the Church that there should be good and bad fish in the net, to be separated only when the net should have been brought to the shore of eternity, tares and wheat in the field,

which were to be let alone till the harvest. We know that the Baptists have no more succeeded in keeping false brethren out of their society than earlier sects who fell into the same unscriptural delusion. But let us take it to heart that the absence of discipline in the Church, and the toleration of manifold offences in it, are a great scandal to many simple, pious minds, and perhaps one of the most fruitful causes of religious, as distinguished from political, dissent.

The Baptists shared the political history of their kindred sect of Independents during the period from their origin down to their liberation from civil disabilities by the Test Act. Their body has shared the fate of all other sects in continual subdivision. First it divided into two in 1660, when some who repudiated the Calvinistic doctrines seceded and formed themselves into a "Connexion of General Baptists," the original body being thenceforward distinguished as "Particular Baptists." In 1770 there was a further subdivision of the General Baptists, the seceders styling themselves the New Connexion of General Baptists. In 1812 these various divisions associated themselves into a Baptist Union.

The Wesleyans. The greatest and most lamentable schism was of later date and of very different character from the three which we have thus sketched.

In the year 1726, John Wesley, a Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, his brother Charles, who was of Christ Church, Oxford, George Whitfield, of Pembroke, Hervey, the author of the 'Meditations,' and about twelve other earnest young men, formed among themselves one of the little societies which were then in vogue for mutual edification in religious learning and holy living. Wesley says of it: "In November, 1727, at which time I came to

reside at Oxford, my brother and I, and two or three young gentlemen more, agreed to spend three or four evenings a week together. On Sunday evening we read something in divinity, on other nights the Greek and Latin classics. In the following summer we were desired to visit the prisoners in the castle, and we agreed to visit them twice a week. Soon after we were desired to call upon a poor woman in the town who was sick, and in this employment too we believed it would be worth while to spend an hour or two in every week. Soon after we all agreed to communicate as often as we could (which was then once a week at Christ Church). In April, 1732, Mr. Clayton, of Brazenose College, began to meet with us. It was by his advice we began to observe the fasts of the ancient Church every Wednesday and Friday. This was the beginning of the Methodist Society."

Whitfield lived at Oxford a most austere and self-denying life, spending whole days in lying prostrate on the ground in prayer, choosing the worst food, and wearing the meanest apparel; keeping the fasts of the Church, and especially Lent, with the most rigid abstinence, so that at the end of the forty days he had scarcely strength to creep up-stairs. His general character for devotion, his demeanour at church, and his visiting the poor, had attracted the notice of Dr. Benson, Bishop of Gloucester. He sent for him one day after the evening service, and asked his age. He was only twenty-one. The bishop said that although twenty-three was the proper age, he should think it his duty to ordain him at once, if he wished to present himself for Holy Orders. After days of abstinence and prayer he was ordained. He preached his first sermon in St. Mary-le-Crypt, and with so much fervour and effect that the bishop was told that fifteen persons had been driven mad by the sermon.

The bishop replied "that he hoped the madness would not be forgotten before next Sunday."

Bishop Potter advised J. Wesley not to bury himself in a rural parish, but, maintained by his fellowship, to devote himself to the special kind of work for which he seemed so especially fitted. The same wise prelate, when Archbishop of Canterbury, marked out for him his line of usefulness: "Do not spend your time in controversy, but in attacking the strongholds of vice, and in promoting personal holiness." The nature and importance of their work gradually developed itself: it was a revival of spiritual earnestness in the Church of England. There was a curious likeness between their early course and that of the High Church revival of the present generation. They took literally the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, rescued them from half-belief and formalism, and put life and enthusiasm into them. In all this early part of their work, the Wesleys and their companions had the sympathy and encouragement of right-minded Churchmen.

In October, 1735, John Wesley sailed as a missionary to Georgia, where he laboured two years and lived a very ascetic life. But he was at last driven out of the colony, the charges against him arising chiefly out of his endeavour to enforce Church discipline; he refused to baptize except by immersion, unless the parents would certify him, according to the rubric, that the child was weak and could not bear it; he refused to bury a person not baptized by a minister episcopally ordained; he refused to admit persons who were not communicants as sponsors; he refused communion to those whose conduct seemed to him inconsistent. He divided the Church services, performing Morning Prayer at 5 in the morning, and celebrating the Holy Communion, with

sermon, as a separate service at 11. The popular opinion of his conduct was expressed by one who said: "The people say they are Protestants, but as for you, they cannot tell what religion you are of. They never heard of such a religion before, and they do not know what to make of it."

On his outward voyage to Georgia, and during his residence there, Wesley had come into communication with a company of Moravians, and had imbibed from them some new doctrines and methods of conversion which were not in accordance with the doctrines and methods of the Church of England. Two new doctrines which he thus took up are still distinctive of Wesleyan teaching: (1) The doctrine that instantaneous and sensible conversion is the general mode of the Holy Spirit's dealing with the soul. To this conversion was given the name of the "New Birth," the name which the New Testament and the Church for seventeen centuries had given to the grace of baptism. (2) The doctrine of perfection, *i. e.* the doctrine that he that is "born of God," in this sensible conversion, is at once translated from sin to holiness.

Preaching these doctrines vehemently, and declaiming against the more sober and scriptural teaching of the Church of England, Wesley began to find the pulpits of the Church closed against him. Gibson, Bishop of London, a mild and conciliatory man, reasoned and remonstrated with him in vain.

George Whitfield, who was at work in the west, finding himself excluded from the pulpits, took to preaching in the open air with great effect, and was followed by very large congregations of the most ignorant classes, until he was inhibited from so preaching by the Chancellor of Bristol. The question of building places to preach

in pressed upon them, and the first Wesleyan meeting-house was built in the Horse Fair at Bristol in 1739, and the Foundry House in London opened in the same year

In 1741, Wesley separated himself from Whitfield on account of the Calvinism of the latter. The Arminian Methodists continued under Wesley's guidance to account themselves members of the Church. They frequented the Church services and sacraments, and only met for mutual edification at hours at which the church was closed. The Calvinistic Methodists formed themselves into a kind of Independent sect, known as Lady Huntingdon's Connexion.

In 1744, a meeting was held in London by John Wesley and six clergymen of his Connexion and four lay preachers to consider their future course. This is reckoned the first Conference, and from this time a Conference was held annually.

About the year 1750, Wesley's Connexion had assumed much of the organization of a separate sect. The breach between it and the Church was widening, and the question of secession from the Church was openly broached. In 1755, it was debated for three days in Conference, the decision being that "whether it was lawful or not it was not expedient to separate from the Church," and the lay preachers "consented, for the sake of peace, to cease to administer the sacraments."

In 1784, Wesley drew up a Deed of Declaration, which was formally enrolled in Chancery, for the perpetuation of his Connexion. He appointed 100 preachers as trustees of all the property belonging to the body, and gave to this "legal hundred" almost unlimited power to settle by a majority all questions which might arise.

Wesley maintained to the end of his life his attitude of loyalty to the Church of England: he opposed the formation of his followers into a sect, and refused to recognize the lay preachers as anything more than lay preachers. But in this year, 1784, moved to it by the anomalous condition of the Church in the North American colonies, he consented to appoint two clergymen as superintendents (*i. e.* bishops) and two laymen as elders (*i. e.* presbyters) for the societies of his followers in America. There is no denying that the condition of the Church in America was unsatisfactory, with no bishops to organize and rule, ordain and confirm. But the sequel is a warning against applying illegitimate remedies to the most palpable evils; had Wesley waited only ten weeks longer he would have found the desired episcopate for America supplied by the ordination of Bishop Seabury, and would have been saved the responsibility of thus usurping the power of ordination.

But in England, to the end of his life, he succeeded in resisting the desire of his lay preachers to assume sacerdotal functions, and of his followers to form themselves into a Church. In the Code of Directions which he gave to his preachers on "the rules by which they were to walk," and which are described by the Wesleyan Conference in 1797 as "the rules to which they consented when they were admitted," are the following instructions:—"How should an Assistant be qualified for his charge? By loving the Church of England, and by resolving not to separate from it. Let this be well observed. I fear that when the Methodists leave the Church God will leave them. Oh, use every means to prevent this! (1) Exhort all our people to keep close to the Word and Sacrament. (2) Warn them all against niceness of hearing—a prevailing evil. (3) Warn them

against despising the prayers of the Church. (4) Against calling our society 'a church.' (5) Against calling our preachers 'ministers,' our houses meeting-houses, call them plain 'preaching-houses.'"

It is abundantly clear that John Wesley was in heart loyal to the Church of England to the last. He desired to supplement it, not to supplant it; to form a Society within it, not to organize a rival Church outside it. In 1788, at the Conference he writes: "One of the most important points considered at this Conference was that of leaving the Church. The sum of a long conversation was: (1) That in a course of fifty years we had neither premeditatedly nor willingly varied from it in one article either of doctrine or discipline. (2) That we were not yet conscious of varying from it in any point of doctrine. (3) That we have in a course of years, out of necessity, not choice, slowly and warily varied from it in some points of discipline, by preaching in the fields, by extemporary prayer, by employing lay preachers, by forming and regulating societies, and by holding yearly conferences. But we did none of these things till we were convinced we could no longer omit them at the peril of our souls." In 1790, only nine months before his death, he published in his own Arminian Magazine the following words:—"In 1744, all the Methodist preachers had their first Conference. But none of them dreamed that the being called to preach gave them any right to administer sacraments. . . . Did we ever appoint you to administer sacraments, to exercise the priestly office? Such a design never entered into our mind; it was the farthest from our thoughts. . . . So long as the Methodists keep to this plan, they cannot separate from the Church. And this is our peculiar glory. It is new upon the earth. Revolve all the histories of the Church,

from the earliest ages, and you will find, whenever there was a great work of God in any city or nation, the subjects of that work soon said to their neighbours, 'Stand by yourselves, for we are holier than you!' As soon as ever they separated themselves they retired into the deserts, or they built religious houses; or, at least, formed parties into which none were admitted but such as subscribed both to their judgment and practice. But with the Methodists it is quite otherwise. They are not a sect or party—they do not separate from the religious community to which they at first belonged. They are still members of the Church; such they desire to live and die. And I believe one reason why God is pleased to continue my life so long is to confirm them in their present purpose, not to separate from the Church.

"I wish all of you who are vulgarly called Methodists would seriously consider what has been said. And particularly you whom God has commissioned to call sinners to repentance. It does by no means follow from hence that ye are commissioned to baptize or to administer the Lord's Supper. Ye never dreamed of this for ten or twenty years after ye began to preach. Ye did not then, *like Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, seek the priesthood* also (Num. xvi. 10). Ye know that no man *taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron* (Heb. v. 4). Oh, contain yourselves within your own bounds! Be content with preaching the Gospel. *Do the work of evangelists.* Proclaim to all the world the loving-kindness of God our Saviour; declare to all *the kingdom of heaven is at hand: repent ye and believe the Gospel.* I earnestly advise you abide in your place: keep your own station. . . . Ye yourselves were first called in the Church of England; and though you have and will have a thousand tempt-

ations to leave it and set up for yourselves, regard them not. Be Church of England men still. Do not cast away the peculiar glory which God hath put upon you, and frustrate the design of Providence, the very end for which He raised you up."

John Wesley died in 1791. In 1793, the Conference put forth some minutes, in which it still maintained its principles; it said that the Wesleyan teachers are only preachers and expounders of God's Word, and that "the attempts that have been lately made to introduce the *ordination scheme* have produced many and great evils in various places, and if persisted in must divide the people, and in the end destroy the cause. We therefore stand forward to declare our intention of abiding by and supporting the original Methodist plan."

In 1795, however, the secession was accomplished, and the preachers were authorized by Conference to administer the sacraments.

The "division of the people" of which Wesley had spoken soon began. Only two years after, in 1797, on a question of admitting lay representatives to Conference, a split took place, and the Methodist New Connexion was formed. Again, in 1810, the question of open-air preaching and revivals caused another schism, and the Primitive Methodists broke off. In 1815 the Bible Christians seceded. In 1835 Dr. Warren disagreed with Conference on a question about the theological college, and was expelled; and he and those who sympathized with him formed the Wesleyan Methodist Association. And yet once more, in 1849, another party, dissatisfied with the action of Conference, seceded and formed the Wesleyan Methodist Reformers.[1]

[1] For information on the doctrines and history of other Dissenting bodies, see Curteis's 'Bampton Lectures.'

The melancholy truth forced upon us by the facts dealt with in this chapter is the division and consequent enfeeblement of English Christianity by Dissent. Some try to make us believe that this very division is an advantage, through the rivalry which it creates between the different religious bodies. But the mind of Christ is not for rivalry but for unity: "Neither pray I for these alone (viz., the Apostles), but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be one in us" (John xvii. 20, 21). We are one in spirit, plead some, notwithstanding these external divisions. But the Apostles, whose task it was, under special Divine guidance, to embody the mind of Christ in the practical organization and working of His Church, earnestly deprecated these divisions, and condemned those who promoted them. "Be ye all of one mind" (1 Peter iii. 8; Acts i. 14, ii. 1, 46, iv. 44, v. 12; 1 Cor. i. 10, xiii. 11; Phil. i. 27, ii. 2, iv. 2). "Mark them which cause divisions . . . . and avoid them" (Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. i. 10, iii. 3, xi. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 3).

An eloquent Nonconformist leader argues that the different denominations are like the different corps of an army, wearing different uniforms, and using different weapons, but all fighting in the common cause against the common enemy. An admirable illustration! The enemy could desire nothing better than that the army opposed to him should be divided into independent corps, jealous of one another, under different commands, without any attempt at unity of plan and concurrent action.

When we study the actual results of division, we see that God's awful rebuke of sin loses its force on the

sinner's conscience when the authority of the prophet who utters the rebuke is disputed by rival prophets. The sceptic is inevitably encouraged in his doubts by the fact that when he asks what to believe, English religion replies in 180 discordant voices. They who have to deal with the practical details of religious work know how they are vexed and thwarted and weakened in every parish by our religious divisions. The citizen who conceives some comprehensive plan for the evangelizing of the town in which he lives, soon finds that the religious divisions of the town make common interest and united action absolutely impossible. The statesman knows how not only the religious, but the civil, social, educational, and moral life of the nation are cramped and dwarfed and embittered by these religious rivalries and animosities. Let us at least open our eyes to facts, and recognize that these divisions are an evil.

And it is not among ourselves only that the evil works. These divisions of our English Christianity have unhappily been propagated to every country to which our English Christianity has been carried—to the United States, to every one of our colonies, to every heathen country to which our missionary labours have extended, and everywhere it hinders the cause of Christ. It is this spectacle of the endless divisions and disorders of our English Christianity which makes the other ancient Churches of Christendom afraid to follow the example of our Reformation.

Nothing probably would so greatly tend to the purification and revival of the spiritual life of Christendom, to the reunion of the divided and distracted Churches, to the spread of Christianity among the heathen nations of the world, as the reunion of English Christianity. This reunion can only take place, so far as human

wisdom can foresee, by the gradual re-absorption of the masses of the population into the body of the Church. The Church has reformed most of the abuses which alienated many from her in the past, and is proceeding in the path of reform. She cannot give up the points of doctrine and of essential organization on which the sects formally base their separation. But, on the other hand, there are among the Dissenting communities thousands of individuals who are what they are not from any well-considered conscientious objections, but from early training or accidental preferences, or ignorance of what the Church really is and believes. These might—they would if they saw all the evils created by division—reunite themselves to the mother Church, the historic Church of England. Separations as numerous, as long-standing, and far more embittered, have again and again in the long history of the Church of Christ thus died out.

This reunion of English Christianity is the key of the ecclesiastical position of Christendom. The example of England would be followed in the colonies, and countries which are influenced by England. This would give such strength and prestige to the Anglican communion as would affect the whole Church of Christ. And a revived and reunited Christendom would surely be the precursor of the fulfilment of our Lord's declaration that the unity of His disciples was the condition on which the world would believe that God had sent Him: "That they may be one in us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John xvii. 21); "I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me" (John xvii. 23).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED, BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.